arXiv:0810.2369v2 [math-ph] 28 Oct 2008

THE NON-RELATIVISTIC LIMIT OF THE EULER NORDSTRÖM SYSTEM WITH COSMOLOGICAL CONSTANT

JARED SPECK

Abstract. In this paper the author studies the singular limit $c \to \infty$ of the family of Euler-Nordström systems indexed by the parameters κ^2 and c (EN_{κ}^{c}), where $\kappa^2 > 0$ is the cosmological constant and c is the speed of light. Using Christodoulou's techniques to generate energy currents, the author develops Sobolev estimates that show that for initial data belonging to an appropriate Sobolev space, as c tends to infinity, the solutions to the EN_{κ}^{c} system converge uniformly on a spacetime slab $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ to the solution of the Euler-Poisson system with the cosmological constant κ^2.

1. Introduction

The Euler-Nordström system describes the evolution of a relativistic perfect fluid with self-interaction mediated by Nordström's theory of gravity. In [18], we introduced the system in dimensionless units and showed that the Cauchy problem is locally well-posed in the Sobolev space[1] H^N for $N \geq 3$. In this article, we study the Newtonian (also known as the "non-relativistic") limit of the family of Euler-Nordström systems indexed by the parameters κ and c (EN_{κ}^{c}), where κ^2 is the cosmological constant[2] and c is the speed of light. The limit $c \to \infty$ is singular because the EN_{κ}^{c} system is hyperbolic for all finite c, while the limiting system, namely the Euler-Poisson system with a cosmological constant (EP_{κ}), is not hyperbolic. Using Christodoulou's techniques [6] to generate energy currents, together with elementary harmonic analysis, we develop Sobolev estimates and use them to study the singular limit $c \to \infty$. Although we explicitly discuss only the EN_{κ}^{c} system in this article, the techniques we apply can be generalized under suitable hypotheses to study singular limits of hyperbolic systems that derive from a Lagrangian and that feature a small parameter[3]. Readers who are interested in similar examples of the analysis of singular limits in partial differential equations may consult e.g. [4], [11], or [15]. Our main theorem, which we state here loosely, is the following; we state and prove it rigorously as Theorem 4:

Theorem (Non-relativistic Limit). *For initial data belonging to the affine Sobolev space* $H_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}^{N}$*, with* $N \geq 4$*, the corresponding unique solutions to the* EN_{κ}^{c} *system (with* $\kappa^2 > 0$*) converge uniformly on a spacetime slab* $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ *to the unique solutions of the* EP_{κ} *system as the speed of light* c *tends to infinity.*

As discussed in [18], we consider the EN_{κ}^{c} system to be a mathematical scalar caricature of the Euler-Einstein system with cosmological constant (EE_{κ}^{c}). We now provide some justification for this point of view. First of all, like the EE_{κ}^{c} system, the EN_{κ}^{c} system is a metric theory of gravity featuring gravitational waves that propagate along null cones. Second, the main theorem stated above shows that if $\kappa^2 > 0$ and c is large, then the EN_{κ}^{c} system well-approximates the EP_{κ} system. Furthermore, in [15], Oliynyk shows the existence of a class of non-stationary solutions to the EE_{0}^{c} system that converge to solutions of the EP_{0} system in the Newtonian limit. Hence, for $\kappa^2 > 0$, the Newtonian limit of the EN_{κ}^{c} system is the EP_{κ} system, while the Newtonian limit of EE_{0}^{c} is the EP_{0}

Date: Version of October 28^{th}, 2008.

[1] More precisely, we showed local well-posedness in a suitable affine shift of H^N for $N \geq 3$, where by "affine shift" of H^N we mean the collection of all functions F such that $\|F - \bar{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^N} < \infty$, where $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$ is a fixed constant array; see Section 2 for further discussion of this function space.

[2] The parameter $\kappa^2 > 0$ is fixed throughout this article. Remark 4.1 contains an explanation of why our proof breaks down in the case $\kappa^2 = 0$.

[3] The small parameter is c^{-2} in the case of the EN_{κ}^{c} system.

system. Based on these considerations, we therefore expect[4] that achieving an understanding of the evolution of the EN_κ^c system will provide insight into the behavior of the vastly more complicated EE_κ^c system.

1.1. **Outline of the Structure of the Paper.**

Before proceeding, we outline the structure of this article. In Section 2, we introduce some notation that we use throughout our discussion. In Section 3, we derive the EN_κ^c equations with the parameter c and then rewrite the equations using Newtonian state-space variables, a change of variables that is essential for comparing the relativistic system EN_κ^c to the classical system EP_κ. In Section 4, we provide for convenience the EN_κ^c and EP_κ systems in the form used for the remainder of the article. From this form, it is clear that formally, $\lim_{c\to\infty} \mathrm{EN}_\kappa^c = \mathrm{EP}_\kappa$. In Section 5, we introduce standard PDE matrix notation and discuss the Equations of Variation (EOV_κ^c), which are the linearization of the EN_κ^c and EP_κ systems. In Section 6, we provide an extension of the Sobolev-Moser calculus that is useful for bookkeeping of the powers of c. We also introduce some hypotheses on the $c-$dependence of the equation of state that are sufficient to prove our main theorem. We then apply the calculus to the EN_κ^c system by proving several preliminary lemmas that are useful in the technical estimates that appear later. Roughly speaking, the lemmas describe the $c \to \infty$ asymptotics of the EN_κ^c system.

In Section 7, we introduce the energy currents that are used to control the Sobolev norms of the solutions. One of the essential features of the currents that we use is that they have a positivity property that is uniform for all large c. In Section 8, we describe a class of initial data for which our main theorem holds, and in Section 9, we smooth the initial data for technical reasons. In Section 10, we recall the local existence result of [18] and prove an important precursor to our main theorem. Namely, we prove that solutions to the EN_κ^c system exist on a common interval of time $[0,T]$ for all large c. This proof is separated into two parts. The first part is a continuous induction argument based on some technical lemmas. The second part is the proof of these technical lemmas, which are a series of energy estimates derived with the aid of the calculus developed in Section 6. The two basic tools we use for generating the energy estimates are energy currents and the estimate $\|\Phi\|_{H^2} \leq C \cdot \|\Delta\Phi - \kappa^2\Phi\|_{L^2}$, for $\Phi \in H^2$. In Section 11, we state and prove our main theorem.

2. REMARKS ON THE NOTATION

We introduce here some notation that is used throughout this article, some of which is non-standard. We assume that the reader is familiar with standard notation for the L^p spaces and the Sobolev spaces H^k. Unless otherwise stated, the symbols L^p and H^k refer to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $H^k(\mathbb{R}^3)$ respectively.

2.1. **Notation Regarding Differential Operators.**

If F is a scalar or finite-dimensional array-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^{1+3}$, then DF denotes the array consisting of all first-order spacetime partial derivatives (including the partial derivative with respect to time) of every component of F, while $\nabla^{(a)}F$ denotes the array of consisting of all a^{th} order *spatial* partial derivatives of every component of F; this should not be confused with ∇, which represents covariant differentiation.

2.2. **Index Conventions.**

We adopt Einstein's convention that diagonally repeated Latin indices are summed from 1 to 3, while diagonally repeated Greek indices are summed from 0 to 3. Indices are raised an lowered using a spacetime metric, which varies according to context.

2.3. **Notation Regarding Norms and Function Spaces.**

If $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$ is a constant array, we use the notation

$$\|F\|_{L^p_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}(E)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|F - \bar{\mathbf{V}}\|_{L^p(E)}, \tag{2.3.1}$$

---

[4] We temper this expectation by recalling that our proof does not work in the case $\kappa^2 = 0$ and that in contrast to the initial value problem studied here, Oliynyk considers the case $\kappa^2 = 0$ with compactly supported data under an adiabatic equation of state. This special class of equations of state allows one to make a "Makino" change of variable which regularizes the equations and overcomes the singularities that typically occur in the equations in regions where the proper energy density vanishes. Furthermore, this change of variables enables one to write the relativistic Euler equations in symmetric hyperbolic form. See [12] and [16] for additional examples of this change of variables in the context of various fluid models.

and we denote the set of all Lebesgue measurable functions F such that $\|F\|_{L^p_{\mathbf{V}}(E)} < \infty$ by $L^p_{\mathbf{V}}(E)$. We also define the $H^N_{\mathbf{V}}(E)$ norm of F by

$$\|F\|_{H^N_{\mathbf{V}}(E)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq N} \|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}} F\|^2_{L^2_{\mathbf{V}}(E)} \Big)^{1/2}. \tag{2.3.2}$$

Unless we indicate otherwise, we assume that $E = \mathbb{R}^3$ when the set E is not explicitly written.

If F is a map from $[0,T]$ into the normed function space X, we use the notation

$$||| \, F \, |||_{X,T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|F(t)\|_X. \tag{2.3.3}$$

We also use the notation $C^k([0,T],X)$ to denote the set of k-times continuously differentiable maps from $(0,T)$ into X that, together with their derivatives up to order k, extend continuously to $[0,T]$.

If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (d frequently equals $3, 4$, or 10 in this article), then $C^k_b(\bar{E})$ denotes the set $k-$times continuously differentiable functions (either scalar or array-valued, depending on context) on E with bounded derivatives up to order k that extend continuously to the closure of E. The norm of a function $F \in C^k_b(\bar{E})$ is defined by

$$|F|_{k,E} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq k} \sup_{z \in E} |\partial_{\vec{\alpha}} F(z)|, \tag{2.3.4}$$

where $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}$ represents differentiation with respect to the arguments z of F (which may be spacetime variables or state-space variables, depending on the context).

2.4. **Notation for $c-$independent Inequalities.** If A_c is a quantity that depends on the parameter c, and X is a quantity such that $A_c \leq X$ holds for all large c, then we indicate this by writing

$$A_c \lesssim X. \tag{2.4.1}$$

2.5. **Notation Regarding Constants.** We use the symbol C to denote a generic constant in the estimates below which is free to vary from line to line. If the constant depends on quantities such as real numbers N, subsets E of $\mathbb{R}^d$, functions $\mathfrak{F}$ of the state-space variables, etc., that are peripheral to the argument at hand, we sometimes indicate this dependence by writing $C(N, E, \mathfrak{F})$, etc. We explicitly show the dependence on such quantities when it is (in our judgment) illuminating, but we often omit the dependence on such quantities when it overburdens the notation without being illuminating. Occasionally, we shall use additional symbols such as Λ_1, Z, L_2, etc., to denote constants that play a distinguished role in the discussion.

3. The Origin of the EN^c_κ System

In this section, we insert both the speed of light c and Newton's universal gravitational constant G into the Euler-Nordström system with a cosmological constant and perform a Newtonian change of variables, which brings the system into the form (4.1.1) - (4.1.8). A similar analysis for the Vlasov-Nordström system[5] is carried out in [4].

3.1. Deriving the Equations with c as a Parameter.

We assume that spacetime is a four-dimensional Lorentzian manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and that furthermore, there is a global rectangular (inertial) coordinate system on $\mathcal{M}$. We use the notation

$$x = (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) \tag{3.1.1}$$

to denote the components of a spacetime point x in this fixed coordinate system, and for this preferred time-space splitting, we identify $t = x^0$ with time and $\mathbf{s} = (x^1, x^2, x^3)$ with space. Note that we are breaking with the usual convention, which is $x^0 = ct$. The components of the Minkowski metric and its inverse in the inertial coordinate system are given by $\underline{g}_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-c^2, 1, 1, 1)$ and $\underline{g}^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-c^{-2}, 1, 1, 1)$ respectively. We adopt Nordström's postulate, namely that the *spacetime metric* g is related to the Minkowski metric by a conformal scaling factor:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^{2\phi} \underline{g}_{\mu\nu}. \tag{3.1.2}$$

---

[5] The Vlasov-Nordström (VN) model describes a particle density function f on physical space × momentum space that evolves due to self-interaction mediated by Nordström's theory of gravity. Various aspects of this system are studied, for example, in [2], and [3].

In (3.1.2), ϕ is the dimensionless[6] *cosmological Nordström potential*, a scalar quantity.

We now briefly introduce the notion of a relativistic perfect fluid. Readers may consult [1] or [5] for more background. For a perfect fluid model, the components of the energy-momentum-stress density tensor (which is commonly called the "energy-momentum tensor" in the literature) of matter read

$$T^{\mu\nu} = c^{-2}(\rho + p)u^\mu u^\nu + pg^{\mu\nu} = c^{-2}(\rho + p)u^\mu u^\nu + e^{-2\phi}p\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.1.3}$$

where ρ is the *proper energy density* of the fluid, p is the *pressure* (this "proper" quantity is defined in a local rest frame), and u is the *four-velocity*, which is subject to the normalization constraint

$$g_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = e^{2\phi}\underline{g}_{\mu\nu}u^\mu u^\nu = -c^2. \tag{3.1.4}$$

The Euler equations for a perfect fluid are (see e.g. [5])

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0 \qquad (\nu = 0, 1, 2, 3) \tag{3.1.5}$$

$$\nabla_\mu (nu^\mu) = 0, \tag{3.1.6}$$

where n is the *proper number density* and ∇ denotes the covariant derivative induced by the spacetime metric g.

Nordström's theory[7] [14] provides the following evolution equation[8] for ϕ : we define an auxiliary energy-momentum-stress density tensor

$$T^{\mu\nu}_{\text{aux}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{6\phi}T^{\mu\nu} = c^{-2}e^{6\phi}(\rho + p)u^\mu u^\nu + e^{4\phi}p\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.1.7}$$

and postulate that ϕ is a solution to

$$\Box\phi - \kappa^2\phi = -4\pi c^{-4}Ge^{4\phi}\mathrm{tr}_g T = -4\pi c^{-4}G\underline{g}_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}_{\text{aux}} = 4\pi c^{-4}Ge^{4\phi}(\rho - 3p). \tag{3.1.8}$$

Note that

$$\Box\phi \overset{\text{def}}{=} \underline{g}^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\phi = -c^{-2}\partial_t^2\phi + \triangle\phi \tag{3.1.9}$$

is the wave operator on flat spacetime applied to ϕ. The virtue of the postulate equation (3.1.8), as we shall see, is that it provides us with continuity equations (3.2.7) for an energy-momentum-stress density tensor Θ in Minkowski space.

We introduce the thermodynamic variable η, the *proper entropy density*, and close the system by supplying an equation of state, which may depend on c. A "physical" equation of state for a perfect fluid state satisfies the following criteria (see e.g. [8]):

1) $\rho \geq 0$ is a function of $n \geq 0$ and $\eta \geq 0$.

2) $p \geq 0$ is defined by

$$p = n\left.\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial n}\right|_\eta - \rho, \tag{3.1.10}$$

where the notation $|_\cdot$ indicates partial differentiation with $\cdot$ held constant.

3) A perfect fluid satisfies

$$\left.\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial n}\right|_\eta > 0,\ \left.\frac{\partial p}{\partial n}\right|_\eta > 0,\ \left.\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial\eta}\right|_n \geq 0 \text{ with `` = '' iff } \eta = 0. \tag{3.1.11}$$

As a consequence, we have that σ, the speed of sound in the fluid, is always real for $\eta > 0$:

$$\sigma^2 \overset{def}{=} c^2\left.\frac{\partial p}{\partial\rho}\right|_\eta = c^2\frac{\partial p/\partial n|_\eta}{\partial\rho/\partial n|_\eta} > 0. \tag{3.1.12}$$

4) We also demand that the speed of sound is positive and less than the speed of light whenever $n > 0$ and $\eta > 0$:

$$n > 0 \text{ and } \eta > 0 \implies 0 < \sigma < c. \tag{3.1.13}$$

---

[6] In (3.2.12), we rescale the dimensionless cosmological Nordström potential by multiplying it by c^2, and we refer to the rescaled potential as the cosmological Nordström potential.

[7] Norström's theory of gravity, although shown to be physically wrong through experiment, was the first metric theory of gravitation.

[8] Nordström considered only the case $\kappa = 0$.

Postulates **1 - 3** express the laws of thermodynamics and fundamental thermodynamic assumptions, while postulate **4** ensures that vectors that are causal with respect to the sound cone are necessarily causal with respect to the light cone.

By (3.1.11), we can solve for σ^2 and $c^{-2}\rho$ as $c-$indexed functions $\mathfrak{S}_c^2$ and $\mathfrak{R}_c$ respectively of η and p :

$$\sigma^2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p) \tag{3.1.14}$$

$$c^{-2}\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p). \tag{3.1.15}$$

Remark 3.1. We will make use of the following identity implied by (3.1.12), (3.1.14), and (3.1.15):

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_c}{\partial p}(\eta, p)\bigg|_{\eta} = \mathfrak{S}_c^{-2}(\eta, p). \tag{3.1.16}$$

Remark 3.2. Note that $c^{-2}\rho$ has the dimensions of mass density. As we will see in Section 6, $\lim_{c\to\infty}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$ will be identified with the Newtonian mass density.

Remark 3.3. We note that the assumptions $\rho \geq 0, p \geq 0$ together imply that the energy-momentum-stress density tensor (3.1.3) satisfies both the *weak energy condition* ($T_{\mu\nu}X^{\mu}X^{\nu} \geq 0$ holds whenever X is timelike and future-directed) and the *strong energy condition* ($[T_{\mu\nu} - 1/2g^{\alpha\beta}T_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}]X^{\mu}X^{\nu} \geq 0$ holds whenever X is timelike and future-directed). Furthermore, if we assume that the equation of state is such that $p = 0$ when $\rho = 0$, then (3.1.12) and (3.1.13) guarantee that $p \leq \rho$. It is then easy to check that $0 \leq p \leq \rho$ implies the *dominant energy condition* ($-T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}X^{\nu}$ is causal and future-directed whenever X is future-directed and causal).

We summarize by stating that *the equations* (3.1.2) - (3.1.6)*,* (3.1.8)*,* (3.1.10)*, and* (3.1.15) *constitute the* EN_{κ}^{c} *system.*

3.2. A Reformulation of the $\mathbf{EN}_{\kappa}^{c}$ System in Newtonian Variables.

In this section, we reformulate the EN_{κ}^{c} system as a fixed background theory in flat Minkowski space and introduce a Newtonian change of state-space variables. The resulting system (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) is an equivalent formulation of the EN_{κ}^{c} system. We remark that *for the remainder of this article, all indices are raised and lowered with the Minkowski metric* $\underline{g}$, so that $\partial^{\lambda}\phi = \underline{g}^{\mu\lambda}\partial_{\mu}\phi$. To begin, we use the form of the metric (3.1.2) to compute that in our inertial coordinate system, the continuity equation (3.1.5) for the energy-momentum-stress density tensor (3.1.3) is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \nabla_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} &= \partial_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} + 6T^{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}\phi - \underline{g}_{\alpha\beta}T^{\alpha\beta}\partial^{\nu}\phi \\ &= \partial_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} + 6T^{\mu\nu}\partial_{\mu}\phi - e^{-6\phi}\underline{g}_{\alpha\beta}T_{\text{aux}}^{\alpha\beta}\partial^{\nu}\phi \qquad (\nu = 0,1,2,3), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.1}$$

where $T_{\text{aux}}^{\mu\nu}$ is given by (3.1.7). For this calculation we made use of the explicit form of the Christoffel symbols in our rectangular coordinate system:

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha} = \delta_{\nu}^{\alpha}\partial_{\mu}\phi + \delta_{\mu}^{\alpha}\partial_{\nu}\phi - \underline{g}_{\mu\nu}\underline{g}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_{\beta}\phi. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Using the postulated equation (3.1.8) for ϕ, (3.2.1) can be rewritten as

$$0 = e^{6\phi}\nabla_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}\Big[T_{\text{aux}}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{c^4}{4\pi G}\big(\partial^{\mu}\phi\partial^{\nu}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}\partial^{\alpha}\phi\partial_{\alpha}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}\kappa^2\phi^2\big)\Big]. \tag{3.2.3}$$

Let us denote the terms from (3.2.3) that are inside the square brackets as $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$. Since the coordinate-divergence of Θ vanishes, we are provided with local conservation laws in Minkowski space, and we regard Θ as an energy-momentum-stress density tensor.

We also introduce the following state-space variables that play a mathematical role[9] in the sequel:

$$R_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^{-2}\rho e^{4\phi} = e^{4\phi}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) \tag{3.2.4}$$

$$P \overset{\text{def}}{=} pe^{4\phi}. \tag{3.2.5}$$

After we make this change of variables, the components of Θ read

$$\Theta^{\mu\nu} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \big[R_c + c^{-2}P\big]e^{2\phi}u^{\mu}u^{\nu} + P\underline{g}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{c^4}{4\pi G}\Big(\partial^{\mu}\phi\partial^{\nu}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}\partial^{\alpha}\phi\partial_{\alpha}\phi - \frac{1}{2}\underline{g}^{\mu\nu}\kappa^2\phi^2\Big), \tag{3.2.6}$$

---

[9] The "physical" quantities are $\mathfrak{R}_c$ and p.

and we replace (3.1.5) with the equivalent equation

$$\partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} = 0 \qquad (\nu = 0,1,2,3). \tag{3.2.7}$$

We also expand the covariant differentiation from (3.1.6) in terms of coordinate derivatives and the Christoffel symbols (3.2.2), arriving at the equation

$$\partial_\mu \big(n e^{4\phi} u^\mu \big) = 0. \tag{3.2.8}$$

Our goal is to obtain the system EN_κ^c in the form (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) below. To this end, we project (3.2.7) onto the orthogonal complement[10] of u and in the direction of u. We therefore introduce the rank 3 tensor Π, which has the following components in our inertial coordinate system:

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} c^{-2} e^{2\phi} u^\mu u^\nu + \underline{g}^{\mu\nu}. \tag{3.2.9}$$

Π is the projection onto the orthogonal complement of u :

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu} u^\lambda \underline{g}_{\lambda\mu} = 0 \qquad (\nu = 0,1,2,3). \tag{3.2.10}$$

We now introduce the following Newtonian change of state-space variables[11]

$$v^j \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} u^j / u^0 \qquad (j = 1,2,3) \tag{3.2.11}$$

$$\Phi \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} c^2 \phi, \tag{3.2.12}$$

where $\mathbf{v} = (v^1, v^2, v^3)$ is the Newtonian velocity and Φ is the cosmological-Nordström potential. Relation (3.2.11) can be inverted to give

$$u^0 = e^{-\phi} \gamma_c \tag{3.2.13}$$

$$u^j = e^{-\phi} \gamma_c v^j, \tag{3.2.14}$$

where

$$\gamma_c(\mathbf{v}) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{c}{(c^2 - |\mathbf{v}|^2)^{1/2}}. \tag{3.2.15}$$

Remark 3.4. We provide here a brief elaboration on the Newtonian change of variables. Equation (3.2.11) provides the standard relationship between the Newtonian velocity $\mathbf{v}$ and the four-velocity u: if $x^\nu(t)$ $(\nu = 0,1,2,3)$ are the rectangular components of a timelike curve in $\mathcal{M}$ parameterized by $x^0 = t$, and τ denotes the proper time parameter, then we have that $v^j = \partial_t x^j = (\partial\tau/\partial t) \cdot u^j = u^j/u^0$ $(j = 1,2,3.)$

Dimensional analysis suggests the approximate identification (for large c) of the cosmological-Nordström potential Φ from (3.2.12) with the cosmological-Newtonian potential $\Phi_{cos-Newt}$, which by definition solves the non-relativistic equation (4.2.4) below: the cosmological-Newtonian potential has the same dimensions as c^2, which suggests that when considering the limit $c \to \infty$, we should re-scale the dimensionless cosmological-Nordström potential ϕ, as we did in (3.2.12). Indeed, our main result, which is Theorem 4, shows that with an appropriate formulation of the initial value problems for the EN_κ^c and EP_κ systems, we have that $\lim_{c\to\infty} \Phi = \Phi_{cos-Newt}$. Dimensional analysis also suggests the formal identification of R_∞ from (4.2.1) - (4.2.4) with $\lim_{c\to\infty} \mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$ (for now assuming that this limit exists), where $\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$ is defined in (3.1.15).

Furthermore, these changes of variables can be justified through a formal expansion $\phi = \phi_{(0)} + c^{-2}\phi_{(1)} + \cdots$, $R_\infty = R_{(0)} + c^{-2} R_{(1)} + \cdots$, in powers of c^{-2} in equations (4.1.1) - (4.1.4): equating the coefficients of powers of c^{-2} on each side of the equations implies the formal identifications[12] $\phi_{(0)} = 0$ and $(\Delta - \kappa^2)\phi_{(1)} = 4\pi G R_{(0)}$. If we also take into account the equation $(\Delta - \kappa^2)\Phi_{cos-Newt} = 4\pi G R_\infty$ satisfied by the cosmological-Newtonian potential, it follows that $\Phi \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} c^2\phi \approx \phi_{(1)} \approx \Phi_{cos-Newt}$. A similar analysis for the Vlasov-Nordström system is carried out in [4] .

---

[10] We are referring here to the orthogonal complement defined by the Minkowski metric $\underline{g}$.

[11] As suggested by Remark 3.2, even though R_c is not a state-space variable, equation (3.2.4) also represents a Newtonian change of variables.

[12] Upon expansion, the formal equation satisfied by $\phi_{(0)}$ is $(\Delta - \kappa^2)\phi_{(0)} = 0$, and by imposing vanishing boundary conditions at infinity, we conclude that $\phi_{(0)} = 0$.

Upon making the substitutions (3.2.11) - (3.2.12) and lowering an index with $\underline{g}$, the components of Π in our inertial coordinate system read (for $1 \leq j, k \leq 3$):

$$\Pi_0^0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} -c^{-2}\gamma_c^2|\mathbf{v}|^2 \tag{3.2.16}$$

$$\Pi_j^0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^{-2}\gamma_c^2 v^j \tag{3.2.17}$$

$$\Pi_0^j \overset{\text{def}}{=} -\gamma_c^2 v^j \tag{3.2.18}$$

$$\Pi_k^j \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^{-2}\gamma_c^2 v^j v_k + \delta_k^j. \tag{3.2.19}$$

Furthermore, we will also make use of the relation

$$\partial_\lambda \gamma_c = c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^3 v_k \partial_\lambda v^k \qquad (\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3). \tag{3.2.20}$$

Considering first the projection of (3.2.7) in the direction of u, we remark that one may use (3.1.6) and (3.1.10) to conclude that for C^1 solutions, $u_\nu \partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} = 0$ is equivalent to equation (4.1.1).

We now project (3.2.7) onto the orthogonal complement of u, which, with the aid of (3.1.8), gives the three equations $\Pi_\nu^j \partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} = 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \Pi_\nu^j \partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} &= \Pi_\nu^j \big[R_c + c^{-2}P\big](e^\phi u^\mu)\partial_\mu(e^\phi u^\nu) + (\Pi_\nu^j \partial^\nu \phi)\frac{c^4}{4\pi G}(\Box\phi - \kappa^2\phi) \\ &= \Pi_\nu^j \big[R_c + c^{-2}P\big](e^\phi u^\mu)\partial_\mu(e^\phi u^\nu) + (\Pi_\nu^j \partial^\nu \Phi)(R_c - 3c^{-2}P). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.21}$$

After making the substitutions (3.2.12), (3.2.13), (3.2.14), and (3.2.15), and using relation (3.2.20), it follows that for C^1 solutions, (3.2.21) is equivalent to (4.1.3).

We also introduce the nameless quantity Q_c and make use of (3.1.10), (3.1.12), (3.1.14), (3.1.15), (3.1.16), (3.2.4), (3.2.5), and (3.2.12) to express it in the following form:

$$Q_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} n\,\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\bigg|_{\eta,\phi} = \frac{\partial P}{\partial(\rho/c^2)}\bigg|_{\eta,\phi} \cdot n\,\frac{\partial(\rho/c^2)}{\partial n}\bigg|_{\eta} = \mathfrak{Q}_c(\eta, p, \Phi), \tag{3.2.22}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{Q}_c(\eta, p, \Phi) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p)e^{4\Phi/c^2}[\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) + c^{-2}p] = \mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p)[R_c + c^{-2}P]. \tag{3.2.23}$$

Then we use the chain rule together with (3.1.6), (4.1.1), and (3.2.22) to derive

$$e^\phi u^\mu \partial_\mu P + Q_c \partial_\mu(e^\phi u^\mu) = (4P - 3Q_c)e^\phi u^\mu \partial_\mu \phi, \tag{3.2.24}$$

which we may use in place of (3.1.6). Upon making the substitutions (3.2.4), (3.2.5), (3.2.12), (3.2.13), and (3.2.14), and using the relation (3.2.20), it follows that for C^1 solutions, (3.2.24) is equivalent to (4.1.2).

4. The Formal Limit $c \to \infty$ of the EN_κ^c System

For convenience, in this section we list the final form of the EN_κ^c system as derived in sections 3.1 and 3.2. We also take the formal limit $c \to \infty$ to arrive at the EP_κ system and introduce the equations of variation (EOV_κ^c).

4.1. **A Recap of the EN_κ^c System.**

The EN_κ^c system is given by

$$\partial_t \eta + v^k \partial_k \eta = 0 \tag{4.1.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t P + v^k \partial_k P + Q_c \partial_k v^k + c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 Q_c v_k \big(\partial_t v^k + v^a \partial_a v^k\big) \\ &\qquad = (4P - 3Q_c)\big[c^{-2}\partial_t \Phi + c^{-2} v^k \partial_k \Phi\big] \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\gamma_c)^2(R_c + c^{-2}P)\big[\partial_t v^j + v^k \partial_k v^j + c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^j v_k(\partial_t v^k + v^a \partial_a v^k)\big] + \partial_j P \\ &\qquad + c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^j(\partial_t P + v^k \partial_k P) = (3c^{-2}P - R_c)\big(\partial_j \Phi + (\gamma_c)^{-2} v^j [c^{-2}\partial_t \Phi + c^{-2} v^k \partial_k \Phi]\big) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.3}$$

$$-c^{-2}\partial_t^2 \Phi + \Delta\Phi - \kappa^2\Phi = 4\pi G(R_c - 3c^{-2}P), \tag{4.1.4}$$

where $j = 1, 2, 3$,

(4.1.5)

$$\gamma_c = \gamma_c(\mathbf{v}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{c}{(c^2 - |\mathbf{v}|^2)^{1/2}}$$

(4.1.6)

$$R_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{4\Phi/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$$

(4.1.7)

$$Q_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{Q}_c(\eta, p, \Phi) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p)e^{4\Phi/c^2}[\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) + c^{-2}p] = \Big(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_c}{\partial p}(\eta, p)\Big|_\eta\Big)^{-1} e^{4\Phi/c^2}[\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) + c^{-2}p]$$

(4.1.8)

$$P \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{4\Phi/c^2}p,$$

c denotes the speed of light, $\mathfrak{S}_c(\eta, p)$, which is defined in (3.1.16), is the speed of sound, and the functions $\mathfrak{R}_c$ and $\mathfrak{S}_c$ derive from a $c-$indexed equation of state as discussed in Section 3.1. The variables $\eta, p, \mathbf{v} = (v^1, v^2, v^3)$, and Φ denote the entropy density, pressure, (Newtonian) velocity, and cosmological-Nordström potential respectively. Section 6 contains a detailed discussion of the c-dependence of the EN_κ^c System.

4.2. The $\mathbf{EP}_\kappa$ System as a Formal Limit.

Taking the formal limit $c \to \infty$ in the EN_κ^c system gives the Euler-Poisson system with a cosmological constant:

$$\partial_t \eta + v^k \partial_k \eta = 0 \tag{4.2.1}$$

$$\partial_t p + v^k \partial_k p + Q_\infty \partial_k v^k = 0 \tag{4.2.2}$$

$$\partial_t R_\infty + \partial_k (R_\infty v^k) = 0 \tag{4.2.2'}$$

$$R_\infty \big(\partial_t v_j + v^k \partial_k v^j\big) + \partial_j p = -R_\infty \partial_j \Phi \qquad (j = 1, 2, 3) \tag{4.2.3}$$

$$\Delta \Phi - \kappa^2 \Phi = 4\pi G R_\infty, \tag{4.2.4}$$

where

$$R_\infty \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p) \tag{4.2.5}$$

$$Q_\infty \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{Q}_\infty(\eta, p) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}_\infty^2(\eta, p)\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p) = \Big(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_\infty}{\partial p}(\eta, p)\Big|_\eta\Big)^{-1}\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p), \tag{4.2.6}$$

$\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_\infty^2(\eta, p)$ are the limits as $c \to \infty$ of $\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p)$ respectively (see (6.3.1), (6.3.2), and (6.3.3)), and the quantity R_∞ is the Newtonian mass density. Since equations (3.1.16) and (6.3.3) imply that $\partial \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)/\partial p = \mathfrak{S}_\infty^{-2}(\eta, p)$, it then follows with the aid of the chain rule that for C^1 solutions, equations (4.2.2) and (4.2.2') are equivalent. We refer to the solution variable Φ from equation (4.2.4) as the cosmological-Newtonian potential.

This system of equations is discussed in [10], in which, under an *isothermal* equation of state ($p = c_s^2\rho$, where the constant c_s denotes the speed of sound), Kiessling derives the Jeans dispersion relation that arises from linearizing (4.2.2'), (4.2.3), (4.2.4) about a static state in which the background mass density $\bar{\rho}$ is non-zero, followed by taking the limit $\kappa \to 0$.

It is a standard result that the solution to (4.2.4) is given by

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{s}) = \bar{\Phi}_\infty - G\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\frac{e^{-\kappa|\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{s}'|}}{|\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{s}'|}\right)\big[\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta(t, \mathbf{s}'), p(t, \mathbf{s}')) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta}, \bar{p})\big]\, d^3\mathbf{s}', \tag{4.2.7}$$

where the constants $\bar{\Phi}_\infty, \bar{\eta}$, and $\bar{p}$, which are the values of Φ, η, and p respectively in a constant background state, are discussed in Section 8. The boundary conditions leading to this solution are that $\Phi(t, \cdot) - \bar{\Phi}_\infty$ vanishes at ∞, and we view $\Phi(t, \mathbf{s})$ as a (not necessarily small) perturbation of the constant potential $\bar{\Phi}_\infty$.

Remark 4.1. Consider the kernel $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}) = -Ge^{-\kappa|\mathbf{s}|}/|\mathbf{s}|$ appearing in (4.2.7). An easy computation gives that $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}), \nabla^{(1)}\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Therefore, a basic result from harmonic analysis (Young's inequality) implies that the map $f \to \mathcal{K} * f$, where $*$ denotes convolution, is a bounded linear map[13] from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. From this fact and Remark B.2 (alternatively consult Lemma 6-1), it follows that $\Phi(t,\cdot) \in H^{N+1}_{\bar{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ whenever $\eta(t,\cdot), p(t,\cdot) \in H^N_{\bar{\eta}}(\mathbb{R}^3), H^N_{\bar{p}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ respectively. By then applying Lemma A-4, we can further conclude that $\Phi(t,\cdot) \in H^{N+2}_{\bar{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ whenever $\eta(t,\cdot), p(t,\cdot) \in H^N_{\bar{\eta}}(\mathbb{R}^3), H^N_{\bar{p}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

5. The Equations of Variation (EOV^c_κ)

The EOV^c_κ are formed by linearizing the EN^c_κ system (EP_κ system in the case $c = \infty$) around a background solution (BGS) $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ of the form $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} = (\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{v}^1, \cdots, \widetilde{\Phi}_2, \widetilde{\Phi}_3)$. Given such a $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ and inhomogeneous terms $f, g, h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}, h^{(3)}, l$, we define the EOV^c_κ by

$$\partial_t \dot{\eta} + \widetilde{v}^k \partial_k \dot{\eta} = f \tag{5.0.8}$$

$$\partial_t \dot{P} + \widetilde{v}^k \partial_k \dot{P} + \widetilde{Q}_c \partial_k \dot{v}^k + c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2 \widetilde{Q}_c \widetilde{v}_k \big(\partial_t \dot{v}^k + \widetilde{v}^a \partial_a \dot{v}^k\big) = g \tag{5.0.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2(\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P})\big[\partial_t \dot{v}^j + \widetilde{v}^k \partial_k \dot{v}^j + c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2 \widetilde{v}^j \widetilde{v}_k (\partial_t \dot{v}^k + \widetilde{v}^a \partial_a \dot{v}^k)\big]& \\ + \partial_j \dot{P} + c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2 \widetilde{v}^j (\partial_t \dot{P} + \widetilde{v}^k \partial_k \dot{P}) &= h^{(j)}\end{aligned} \tag{5.0.10}$$

$$-c^{-2}\partial_t^2 \dot{\Phi} + \Delta \dot{\Phi} - \kappa^2 \dot{\Phi} = l, \tag{5.0.11}$$

where $\widetilde{\gamma}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} c/(c^2 - |\widetilde{v}|^2)^{1/2}$, $\widetilde{R}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{4\widetilde{\Phi}/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p})$, etc. The unknowns are the components of $\dot{\mathbf{W}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\dot{\eta}, \dot{P}, \dot{v}^1, \dot{v}^2, \dot{v}^3)$ and $\dot{\Phi}$.

Remark 5.1. We place parentheses around the superscripts of the inhomogeneous terms $h^{(j)}$ in order to emphasize that we are merely labeling them, and that in general, we do not associate any transformation properties to them under changes of coordinates.

Let us now provide a few remarks on our notation. We find it useful to analyze both the dependent variable p and the dependent variable P when discussing solutions to (4.1.1) - (4.1.4). Therefore, we will make use of all four of the following arrays:

$$\mathbf{W} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\eta, P, v^1, v^2, v^3) \tag{5.0.12}$$

$$\mathbf{V} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\eta, P, v^1, v^2, v^3, \Phi, \partial_t \Phi, \partial_1 \Phi, \partial_2 \Phi, \partial_3 \Phi) \tag{5.0.13}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\eta, p, v^1, v^2, v^3) \tag{5.0.14}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\eta, p, v^1, v^2, v^3, \Phi, \partial_t \Phi, \partial_1 \Phi, \partial_2 \Phi, \partial_3 \Phi), \tag{5.0.15}$$

where $P \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{4\Phi/c^2}p$. When discussing a BGS $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{v}^1, \cdots, \widetilde{\Phi}_2, \widetilde{\Phi}_3)$ that defines the coefficients of the unknowns in the EOV^c_κ, we also use notation similar to that used in (5.0.12) - (5.0.15), including $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}, \widetilde{v}^1, \cdots, \partial_3 \widetilde{\Phi})$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{v}^1, \widetilde{v}^2, \widetilde{v}^3)$, where $\widetilde{p} \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{-4\widetilde{\Phi}/c^2}\widetilde{P}$, etc. When $c = \infty$, we may also refer to $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}, \widetilde{v}^1, \widetilde{v}^2, \widetilde{v}^3)$ as the BGS, since in this case, the left-hand sides of (5.0.8) - (5.0.11) do not depend on $\widetilde{\Phi}$, and furthermore, $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$. Additionally, we may refer to the unknowns in the EOV^c_κ as $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\dot{\eta}, \dot{p}, \dot{v}^1, \dot{v}^2, \dot{v}^3)$ when $c = \infty$; in this article, $\dot{\Phi}$ will always vanish at infinity, and in the case $c = \infty$, rather than considering $\dot{\Phi}$ to be an "unknown," we assume that the solution variable $\dot{\Phi}$ has been constructed via the convolution $\dot{\Phi} = \mathcal{K} * l$, where the kernel $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})$ is defined in Remark 4.1, and l is the right-hand side of (5.0.11).

We frequently adopt standard PDE matrix notation. For example, we may write (4.1.1) - (4.1.3) as

$${}_c\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi)\partial_\mu \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{b}, \tag{5.0.16}$$

where each ${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\cdot)$ is a 5×5 matrix with entries that are functions of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and Φ, while $\mathbf{b} = (f, g, \cdots, h^{(3)})$ is the 5-component column array on the right-hand side of (4.1.1) - (4.1.3).

Remark 5.2. We emphasize that throughout this article, we operate under the convention that the ${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\cdot)$ are functions of the BGS variables $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}, \widetilde{\Phi}$. We therefore write "${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}, \widetilde{\Phi})$," as opposed to writing "${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}, \widetilde{\Phi})$."

---

[13] Our proof breaks down at this point in the case $\kappa = 0$.

It is instructive to see the form of the ${}_c\mathcal{A}^{\nu}(\cdot)$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, for we will soon concern ourselves with their large$-c$ asymptotic behavior. Abbreviating $\alpha_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\gamma_c)^2\big(R_c + c^{-2}P\big)$, $\beta_c^{(i)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^i, \beta_c^{(i,j)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^i v^j$, we have that

$$
{}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & Q_c\beta_c^{(1)} & Q_c\beta_c^{(2)} & Q_c\beta_c^{(3)} \\ 0 & Q_c\beta_c^{(1)} & \alpha_c(1+\beta_c^{(1,1)}) & \alpha_c\beta_c^{(1,2)} & \alpha_c\beta_c^{(1,3)} \\ 0 & Q_c\beta_c^{(2)} & \alpha_c Q_c\beta_c^{(2,1)} & \alpha_c(1+\beta_c^{(2,2)}) & \alpha_c\beta_c^{(2,3)} \\ 0 & Q_c\beta_c^{(3)} & \alpha_c\beta_c^{(3,1)} & \alpha_c\beta_c^{(3,2)} & \alpha_c(1+\beta_c^{(3,3)}) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.0.17}
$$

$$
{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & R_\infty & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & R_\infty & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & R_\infty \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.0.18}
$$

$$
{}_c\mathcal{A}^1(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} v^1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^1 & Q_c(1+\beta_c^{(1,1)}) & Q_c\beta_c^{(1,2)} & Q_c\beta_c^{(1,3)} \\ 0 & 1+\beta_c^{(1,1)} & \alpha_c v^1(1+\beta_c^{(1,1)}) & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(1,2)} & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(1,3)} \\ 0 & \beta_c^{(1,2)} & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(2,1)} & \alpha_c v^1(1+\beta_c^{(2,2)}) & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(2,3)} \\ 0 & \beta_c^{(3,1)} & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(3,1)} & \alpha_c v^1\beta_c^{(3,2)} & \alpha_c v^1(1+\beta_c^{(3,3)}) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.0.19}
$$

$$
{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^1(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) = \begin{pmatrix} v^1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v^1 & Q_\infty & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & R_\infty v^1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & R_\infty v^1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & R_\infty v^1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.0.20}
$$

etc.

6. ON THE $c-$DEPENDENCE OF THE EN_{κ}^{c} SYSTEM

In addition to appearing directly as the term c^{-2}, the constant c appears in equations (4.1.1) - (4.1.4) through four terms: **1**) $P = e^{4\Phi/c^2}p$, **2**) $\gamma_c = c/(c^2 - |\mathbf{v}|^2)^{1/2}$, **3**) $R_c = e^{4\Phi/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$, and **4**) $Q_c = \mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta, p)e^{4\Phi/c^2}[\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) + c^{-2}p]$. Because we want to recover the EP_κ system in the large c limit, the first obvious requirement we have is that the function $\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p)$ has a limit $\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)$ as $c \to \infty$. For mathematical reasons, we will demand convergence in the norm $|\cdot|_{N+1,\mathfrak{C}}$ at a rate of order c^{-2}, where $\mathfrak{C}$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ that depends on the initial data; see (6.3.1) and (6.3.2). Although a construction of $\mathfrak{C}$ from the initial data is described in detail in Section 8.2, let us now provide a preliminary description that is sufficient for our current purposes: for given initial data, we will prove the existence of compact sets $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$, $[-a, a]^5, K \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5$, $\mathfrak{K} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5$, and a time interval $[0, T]$ so that for all large c, the ($c-$dependent) solutions[14] $\mathbf{V}$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$) to the EN_κ^c system launched by the initial data exist on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and satisfy $\mathbf{W}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$, $\mathbf{V}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset K$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathfrak{K}$. See Section 8.2 for a detailed description of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$, and (10.2.25), (10.2.26) for the construction of K and $\mathfrak{K}$.

The set $\mathfrak{C}$ from above, then, is the projection of $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$ onto the first two axes (recall definition (5.0.14)). Intuitively, we would like the aforementioned four functions of the state-space variables to converge to $p, 1, R_\infty$, and Q_∞ respectively when their domains are restricted to an appropriate compact subset. In this section, we will develop and then assume hypotheses on the $c-$indexed equation of state that will allow us to prove useful versions of these kinds of convergence results.

---

[14] Recall the notation (5.0.12) - (5.0.15) which defines the arrays $\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{V}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ respectively.

6.1. **Functions with $c-$Independent Properties: The Definitions.**

The main technical difficulty that we must confront is ensuring that the Sobolev estimates provided by the propositions appearing in Appendix B can be made independently of all large c. By examining these propositions, one could anticipate that this amounts to analyzing the C_b^j norms (see definition (2.3.4)) of various $c-$indexed families of functions $\mathfrak{F}_c$ arising in the family of EN_κ^c systems. We therefore introduce here some machinery that will allow us to easily discuss uniform-in-c estimates. Following this, we use this machinery to prove some preliminary lemmas that will be used in the proofs of Theorem 2 and Theorem 4, which are the two main theorems of this article. Before proceeding, we refer the reader to the notation defined in (2.4.1), which will be used frequently in the discussion that follows.

Definition 6.1. We define $\mathcal{R}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$ to be the ring consisting of all $c-$indexed families of functions $\mathfrak{F}_c$ of $q_1,\cdots,q_n$ such that for all large c, $\mathfrak{F}_c \in C_b^j(\mathfrak{D})$, and such that the following estimate holds:

$$|\mathfrak{F}_c|_{j,\mathfrak{D}} \lesssim c^k \cdot C(\mathfrak{D}). \tag{6.1.1}$$

We emphasize that the constant $C(\mathfrak{D})$ is allowed to depend on the family $\mathfrak{F}_c$ and the set $\mathfrak{D}$, but within a given family and on a fixed set, $C(\mathfrak{D})$ must be independent of all large c.

Remark 6.1. At the beginning of Section 6.3, we explain why it is sometimes useful to shift the point of view as to what are the arguments of $\mathfrak{F}_c$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{F}_c$ is perhaps best thought of as a "$c-$indexed expression" rather than a "$c-$indexed family of functions."

Definition 6.2. Assume $j \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{I}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$ denotes the sub-ring contained in $\mathcal{R}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$ consisting of all such $c-$indexed functions $\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1,\cdots,q_n)$ such that

$$\|\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1,\cdots,q_n)\|_{H^j} \lesssim c^k \cdot C(\mathfrak{D};\|q_1\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_1}},\cdots,\|q_n\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_n}}) \tag{6.1.2}$$

holds for all constant arrays $(\bar{q}_1,\bar{q}_2,\cdots,\bar{q}_n) \in \mathfrak{D}$ and all array-valued functions $(q_1,\cdots,q_n) \in H^j_{\bar{q}_1}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times\cdots\times H^j_{\bar{q}_n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ having $\{\big(q_1(\mathbf{s}),q_2(\mathbf{s}),\cdots,q_n(\mathbf{s})\big) \mid \mathbf{s}\in\mathbb{R}^3\} \subset \mathfrak{D}$. The constant $C(\mathfrak{D})$ is allowed to depend on the family $\mathfrak{F}_c$ and the set $\mathfrak{D}$, but it can depend on the $q_1,\cdots,q_n$ only through their $H^j_{\bar{q}_i}$ norms[15]. We remark that the spaces $H^j_{\bar{q}_i}$ are defined by (2.3.1).

Remark 6.2. This definition is highly motivated by (B.33) of Appendix B

Remark 6.3. We also emphasize that in our applications below, *the q_i and $\bar{q}_i$ may themselves depend on the parameter c, even though we do not always explicitly indicate this dependence.* Typically, the q_i will be quantities related to solutions of the EN_κ^c system, and the $\bar{q}_i$ will be equal to the components of either (8.1.2), (8.1.10), or (8.1.11), perhaps scaled by a power of c.

Notation. If $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$, then we sometimes write

$$\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1,\cdots,q_n) = \mathcal{O}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n). \tag{6.1.3}$$

Remark 6.4. We employ the following abuse of notation throughout this article: if we have written "$\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1,\cdots,q_n) \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$," then we are indicating that in addition to the c^k-type bound on $\mathfrak{F}_c$ given in (6.1.1), that the functions q_i have the properties stated in Definition 6.2; i.e., we use the notation in quotations to also communicate that $\mathfrak{D}$ is compact and convex, that there are constants $\bar{q}_i$, which will be clear from context, such that $q_i \in H^j_{\bar{q}_i}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, that the image set $\{\big(q_1(\mathbf{s}),q_2(\mathbf{s}),\cdots,q_n(\mathbf{s})\big) \mid \mathbf{s}\in\mathbb{R}^3\}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{D}$, and that $(\bar{q}_1,\bar{q}_2,\cdots,\bar{q}_n)\in\mathfrak{D}$. We employ a similar abuse of notation in writing "$\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1,\cdots,q_n) \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^k;\mathfrak{D};q_1,\cdots,q_n)$."

Remark 6.5. In the notation $\mathcal{R}(\cdots),\mathcal{I}(\cdots)$, and $\mathcal{O}^j(\cdots)$, we often omit the argument $\mathfrak{D}$. In this case, it is understood that there is an implied set $\mathfrak{D}$ that is to be inferred from context; frequently $\mathfrak{D}$ is to be inferred from L^∞ estimates on the q_i that follow from Sobolev embedding. Also, we omit the argument c^k when $k=0$. Furthermore, we have chosen to omit dependence on the constants $\bar{q}_i$ since, as will be explained at the beginning of Section 6.3, their definitions will be clear from context. We will occasionally omit additional arguments when the context is clear.

---

[15] Technically speaking, the $\|\cdot\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_i}}$ are not norms in general, since $\|0\|_{H^j,\bar{q}_i} = \infty$ unless $\bar{q}_i = 0$. This is not a problem because in this article, we only study the $\|\cdot\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_i}}$ "norm" of functions $q(\mathbf{s})$ that by design feature $\|q\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_i}} < \infty$.

6.2. **Functions with $c-$Independent Properties: Useful Lemmas.** The following three lemmas provide the core structure for analyzing the Sobolev norms of terms appearing in the EN_{κ}^{c} system. They are especially useful for keeping track of powers of c. Their proofs are based on the Sobolev-Moser estimates that are stated as propositions in Appendix B.

Lemma 6-1. *If* $j \geq 2$ *and* $\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, *then* $\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n) - \mathfrak{F}_c(\bar{q}_1, \cdots, \bar{q}_n) \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

Proof. We emphasize that the conclusion of Lemma 6-1 is exactly the statement that $\|\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n) - \mathfrak{F}_c(\bar{q}_1, \cdots, \bar{q}_n)\|_{H^j} \lesssim c^k \cdot C(\|q_1\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_1}}, \cdots, \|q_n\|_{H^j_{\bar{q}_n}})$. Its proof follows from definitions 6.1 and 6.2, and from (B.33). ☐

Lemma 6-2. *Suppose that* $j \geq 2$, $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^{k_1}; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, $\mathfrak{G}_c \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^{k_2}; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, *and* $\mathfrak{H}_c \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^{k_3}; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. *Then* $\big(\mathfrak{F}_c \cdot \mathfrak{G}_c\big)(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^{k_1+k_2}; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ *and* $\big(\mathfrak{F}_c \cdot \mathfrak{H}_c\big)(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^{k_1+k_3}; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

Proof. Lemma 6-2 follows from the product rule for derivatives and (B.30). ☐

Remark 6.6. Lemma 6-2 shows that for $k \leq 0$, $\mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ is a ring i.e., it is closed under products. We frequently use this property in this article without explicitly mentioning it.

Remark 6.7. Lemma 6-2 can easily be used to show that if $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^0; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ and for all large c, $\mathfrak{F}_c$ doesn't vanish on $\mathfrak{D}$, then $1/\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^0; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

Remark 6.8. Lemma 6-2 shows that if $\mathfrak{F}_c(\bar{q}_1, \cdots, \bar{q}_n) = 0$, then $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. In particular, if $\bar{q} = 0$, then any polynomial (of strictly positive degree) in q is an element of $\mathcal{I}^j(q)$.

Remark 6.9. Lemma 6-2 shows in particular that for $k \leq 0$, $\mathcal{I}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ is an ideal in $\mathcal{R}^j(\mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

Remark 6.10. If $k \leq 0$ and there is a fixed function $\mathfrak{F}_\infty \in \mathcal{R}^j(\mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ such that $\mathfrak{F}_c - \mathfrak{F}_\infty \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, then it follows that $|\mathfrak{F}_c|_{j,\mathfrak{D}} \lesssim |\mathfrak{F}_\infty|_{j,\mathfrak{D}} + 1$, so that the family $\mathfrak{F}_c$ is uniformly bounded in the norm $|\cdot|_{j,\mathfrak{D}}$ for all large c. A similar remark using the $\|\cdot\|_{H^j}$ norm applies if $\mathfrak{F}_\infty \in \mathcal{I}^j(\mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ and $\mathfrak{F}_c - \mathfrak{F}_\infty \in \mathcal{I}^j(c^k; \mathfrak{D}; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. We often make use of these observations in this article without explicitly mentioning it.

Lemma 6-3. *Suppose that* $j \geq 3$, $k_1 + k_2 = k_0$, *and that* $\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^{k_0}; \mathfrak{D}_1; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. *Assume further that for* $1 \leq i \leq n$, $q_i \in C^0([0,T], H^j_{\bar{q}_i}) \cap C^1([0,T], H^{j-1}_{\bar{q}_i})$ *and that for all large* c, $c^{k_2}\big(\partial_t q_1, \cdots, \partial_t q_n\big)([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathfrak{D}_2$. *Then on* $[0,T]$, *we have that* $\partial_t\Big[\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n)\Big] \in \mathcal{I}^{j-1}(c^{k_1}; \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \mathfrak{D}_2; q_1, \cdots, q_n, c^{k_2}\partial_t q_1, \cdots, c^{k_2}\partial_t q_n)$.

Proof. Lemma 6-3 follows from the chain rule, Lemma 6-2, and Remark 6.8. We emphasize that the constant term associated to $c^{k_2}\partial_t q_i$ is 0, so that on the right-hand side of the definition (6.1.2) of $\mathcal{I}^{j-1}(\cdots)$, we are measuring $c^{k_2}\partial_t q_i$ in the $H^{j-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm. ☐

Corollary 6-4. *Let* ∂_a *be a first-order spatial differential operator. Suppose that* $j \geq 3$, $k_1 + k_2 = k_0$, *and that* $\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^{k_0}; \mathfrak{D}_1; q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. *Assume that for all large* c, $c^{k_2}\big(\partial_a q_1, \cdots, \partial_a q_n\big)([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathfrak{D}_2$. *Then on* $[0,T]$, *we have that* $\partial_a\Big(\mathfrak{F}_c(q_1, \cdots, q_n)\Big) \in \mathcal{I}^{j-1}(c^{k_1}; \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \mathfrak{D}_2; q_1, \cdots, q_n, c^{k_2}\partial_a q_1, \cdots, c^{k_2}\partial_a q_n)$.

Proof. The proof of Corollary 6-4 is virtually identical to the proof of Lemma 6-3. ☐

6.3. **Application to the EN_{κ}^{c} System.**

We will now apply these lemmas to the EN_{κ}^{c} system. Let us first make a few remarks about our use of the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^j,\bar{q}_i}$ that appear on the right-hand side of (6.1.2) and the constant term $\bar{q}_i$ associated to q_i. For the remainder of this article, it is to be understood that the constant term associated to $c^k\mathbf{V}$ is $c^k\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$, that the constant term associated to $c^k\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is $c^k\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$, and the constant term associated to both $D\mathbf{V}$ and $D\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is $\mathbf{0}$, where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ are defined in (8.1.10) and (8.1.11) respectively. Furthermore, the constant term associated to $c^{-k}\mathbf{V}$ is understood to be $c^{-k}\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$, and so forth. In other words, when estimating $c^k\mathbf{V}$ using a $j-$th order Sobolev norm, it is understood that we are using the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^j_{c^k\bar{\mathbf{V}}}}$, and similarly for the other state-space arrays. The relationship between the arrays $\mathbf{V}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is always understood to be the one implied by (5.0.13) and (5.0.15).

We furthermore emphasize that $\mathbf{V}$ (or $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$) will represent a solution array to the EN_{κ}^{c} system, and therefore will implicitly depend on c through the $c-$dependent initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ and through the c dependence of the EN_{κ}^{c} system itself. The fact that the constant arrays $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ depend on the parameter c does not pose any difficulty. For as we shall see, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ is contained in the fixed compact set $\mathfrak{K}$ for all large c, and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ is contained in the fixed compact set K for all large c, where the sets $\mathfrak{K}$ and K were introduced at the beginning of Section 6. Therefore, when we require L^{∞} estimates of the constants $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$, the bounds can be made independently of all large c.

In addition to the above remarks, we add that we will have available a-priori estimates that guarantee that $\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T], H_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}^{N}) \cap C^1([0,T], H_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}^{N-1}) \cap C^2([0,T], H_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}^{N-2})$ for a fixed integer[16] $N \geq 4$ on our time interval $[0,T]$ of interest, which are hypotheses that are relevant for Lemma 6-3 and Corollary 6-4. Our a-priori estimates will also ensure that all of the relevant quantities are contained in an appropriate fixed compact convex set, so that the "hypotheses on the q_i" described in Definition 6.2 will always be satisfied. Consequently, we will often omit the dependence of the running constants $C(\cdots)$ (see Section 2.5) on such sets. The relevant a-priori estimates ("Induction Hypotheses") are described in detail in Section 10.3.1.

Let us now provide a clarifying example and also note that as we change settings, it is sometimes useful to shift the point of view as to what are the arguments of a family $\mathfrak{F}_c(\cdots)$. For example, consider the expression $\mathfrak{F}_c \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} c^{-2}\partial_t\Phi$, where Φ is a solution variable in the EN_{κ}^{c} system depending on c through the initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ and through the $c-$dependence of the system itself. If it is known that $c^{-1}\|\partial_t\Phi\|_{H^3}$ is uniformly bounded by L for all large c, then we have that $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^3(c^{-1}; c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi)$ since $c^{-1}\|c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi\|_{H^3} \lesssim c^{-1}L$. If it also turns out that $\|\partial_t\Phi\|_{H^3}$ is uniformly bounded for all large c, then have that $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^3(c^{-2}; \partial_t\Phi)$. If both estimates are true, then we indicate this by writing $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^3(c^{-1}; c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi) \cap \mathcal{I}^3(c^{-2}; \partial_t\Phi)$ or $\mathfrak{F}_c = \mathfrak{O}^3(c^{-1}; c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi) \cap \mathfrak{O}^3(c^{-2}; \partial_t\Phi)$. These kinds of estimates will enter into our continuous induction argument in Section 10.2, in which we will first prove a bound for $c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi$, and then use it to obtain a bound for $\partial_t\Phi$; see (10.2.21) and (10.2.23).

Remark 6.11. For simplicity, we are not always optimal in our estimates.

The following four lemmas, which provide an analysis of the $c-$dependence of the terms appearing in the EN_{κ}^{c} system, will be used heavily in Section 10.3, which contains most of our technical estimates. Before providing the lemmas, we first restate our hypotheses on the equation of state using our new notation.

Hypotheses on the $c-$Dependence of the Equation of State.

$$\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta,p),\ \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\eta,p) \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(\mathfrak{C};\eta,p) \tag{6.3.1}$$

$$\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta,p) - \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\eta,p) \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(c^{-2};\mathfrak{C};\eta,p), \tag{6.3.2}$$

where the set $\mathfrak{C}$ was introduced at the beginning of Section 6 and is described in detail in Section 8.2. We emphasize that our construction of $\mathfrak{C}$ will depend only on the initial data, and not on the equation of state (although it is clearly not the case that (6.3.1) and (6.3.2) are satisfied by all $c-$indexed equations of state). As a simple consequence of (3.1.16), (6.3.1), and (6.3.2), we have that

$$\mathfrak{S}_c^2(\eta,p) - \mathfrak{S}_{\infty}^2(\eta,p) \in \mathcal{R}^{N}(c^{-2};\mathfrak{C};\eta,p). \tag{6.3.3}$$

We also assume that $\mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\eta,p)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{\infty}^2(\eta,p)$ are "physical" as defined in Section 3.1; i.e., we assume in particular that whenever $\eta, p > 0$, we have $0 < \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\eta,p)$ and $0 < \mathfrak{S}_{\infty}^2(\eta,p)$.

Hypothesis (6.3.1) ensures that the terms appearing in the EN_{κ}^{c} and EP_{κ} systems are sufficiently differentiable functions of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, thus enabling us to apply the Sobolev-Moser type inequalities appearing in Appendix B. It is strong enough to imply Theorem 1 and Theorem 3. Hypothesis (6.3.2) is used in our proof of Theorem 2 and Theorem 4. Although a weakened version of Hypothesis (6.3.2) is sufficient to prove a convergence theorem, we do not pursue this matter here since we are not striving for optimal results.

Lemma 6-5. *With the functions $\gamma_c, R_c, R_{\infty}, Q_c, Q_{\infty}, \mathbf{W}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ of the state-space variables defined in* (4.1.5), (4.1.6), (4.2.5), (4.1.7), (4.2.6), (5.0.12), *and* (5.0.14) *respectively, we have for $m = 0, 1, 2$*

---

[16] The relevance of $N \geq 4$ is described in Section 8.

and $\nu = t, 1, 2, 3$ *the following estimates for all large* c*, including* $c = \infty$:

$$(\gamma_c)^2 - 1 \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{v}) \tag{6.3.4}$$

$$e^{4\Phi/c^2} - 1 \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(c^{m-2}; c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.5}$$

$$R_c - R_\infty = e^{4\Phi/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p) \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(c^{m-2}; \eta, p, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.6}$$

$$Q_c - Q_\infty = \mathfrak{Q}_c(\eta, p, \Phi) - \mathfrak{Q}_\infty(\eta, p) \in \mathcal{R}^{N}(c^{m-2}; \eta, p, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.7}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} - \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{R}^{N}(c^{m-2}; P, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.8}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{R}^{N}(\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.9}$$

$$\partial_\nu \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} - \partial_\nu \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{I}^{N-1}(c^{m-2}; P, \partial_\nu P, c^{-m}\Phi, c^{-m}\partial_\nu \Phi) \tag{6.3.10}$$

$$\partial_\nu \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{I}^{N-1}(\mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi, c^{-m}\partial_\nu \Phi). \tag{6.3.11}$$

Proof. (6.3.4), and (6.3.5) are easy Taylor estimates. (6.3.6) follows from Lemma 6-2, (6.3.1), (6.3.2), and (6.3.5). (6.3.7) then follows from (3.1.16), (3.2.23), (4.2.6), Lemma 6-2, (6.3.3), and (6.3.6). Since $P - p = (1 - e^{-4\Phi/c^2})P$, (6.3.8) follows from (6.3.5), Lemma 6-2, and that the fact that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ differ only in that the second component of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is p, while the second component of $\mathbf{W}$ is P. (6.3.9) is a simple consequence of (6.3.8). (6.3.10) follows from (6.3.8), Lemma 6-3, and Corollary 6-4. (6.3.11) then follows easily from (6.3.10). □

Lemma 6-6. *If* $0 \leq j \leq N$, $k \leq 0$, *and* $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})$, *then for* $m = 0, 1, 2$, *we have that*

$$\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi). \tag{6.3.12}$$

Lemma 6-6 follows easily from expressing $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ in terms of $\mathbf{W}$ and $c^{-m}\Phi$ via (6.3.9) and applying the chain rule. Let us re-phrase the content of Lemma 6-6 in order to be clear: assuming the quantity $\mathfrak{F}_c$, when expressed in terms of the state-space variables $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$, has the regularity/c^k-boundedness properties defined by the class of functions $\mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})$, then upon re-expressing the same quantity $\mathfrak{F}_c$ in terms of the variables $\mathbf{W}, \Phi$, $\Big(\text{i.e. } \mathfrak{F}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) = \mathfrak{F}_c\big(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{W}, \Phi)\big)\Big)$, it has the regularity/$c^k-$boundedness properties defined by the class of functions $\mathcal{R}^j(c^k; \mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi)$.

Lemma 6-7. *Let* ${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi)$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, *denote the matrix-valued functions of* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *and* Φ *introduced in Section 5. Let the* $c-$*dependent relationship between* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *and* $\mathbf{W}, \Phi$ *be defined by* (5.0.12) *and* (5.0.14). *Then for all large* c *including* $c = \infty$, *and for* $m = 0, 1, 2$, *we have that*

$${}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\nu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}),\ \big({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\big)^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^N(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) \cap \mathcal{R}^N(\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.13}$$

$${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi),\ \big({}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi)\big)^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^N(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, c^{-m}\Phi) \cap \mathcal{R}^N(\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.14}$$

$${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi) - {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\nu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) \in \mathcal{R}^N(c^{m-2}; \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, c^{-m}\Phi) \cap \mathcal{R}^N(c^{m-2}; \mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi) \tag{6.3.15}$$

$$\big({}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi)\big)^{-1} - \big({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\big)^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^N(c^{m-2}; \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, c^{-m}\Phi) \cap \mathcal{R}^N(c^{m-2}; \mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi). \tag{6.3.16}$$

Proof. (6.3.13) - (6.3.16) follow from (5.0.17) - (5.0.20), Remark 6.7, Lemma 6-2, Lemma 6-5, Lemma 6-6, the determinant-adjoint formula for the inverse of a matrix, and the hypotheses (6.3.1), (6.3.2) on the equation of state. □

Lemma 6-8. *Let* $\mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \overset{def}{=} \Big(0, 0, -\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)\partial_1\Phi, -\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)\partial_2\Phi, -\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)\partial_3\Phi\Big)$ *denote the right-hand side of* (4.2.1), (4.2.2), (4.2.3), *and let* $\mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi, D\Phi)$ *denote the right-hand side* (4.1.1) - (4.1.3). *Let the* $c-$*dependent relationship between* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *and* $\mathbf{W}, \Phi$ *be defined by* (5.0.12) *and* (5.0.14). *Then for all large* c *including* $c = \infty$, *and for* $m = 0, 1, 2$, *we have that*

$$\mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \in \mathcal{I}^N(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \cap \mathcal{I}^N(\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi), \tag{6.3.17}$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi, D\Phi) \in \mathcal{I}^N(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, c^{-m}\Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi, c^{-m}\partial_t\Phi) \cap \mathcal{I}^N(\mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi, c^{-m}\partial_t\Phi), \tag{6.3.18}$$

and furthermore,

$$\mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi, D\Phi) = \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) + \mathfrak{F}_c, \tag{6.3.19}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^N(c^{m-2}; \mathbf{W}, c^{-m}\Phi, c^{-m}D\Phi). \tag{6.3.20}$$

Proof. (6.3.17) - (6.3.20) all follow from combining the fact that $\mathfrak{B}_c(\bar{\mathbf{W}}_c, \bar{\Phi}_c, 0, 0, 0, 0) = 0$ with Remark 6.8, Lemma 6-2, Lemma 6-5, and Lemma 6-6. □

Example 6.1. As an enlightening example, we discuss the non-relativistic limit of the polytropic equation of state, that is, an equation of state of the form $\rho = m_0 c^2 n + \frac{A_c(\eta)}{\gamma - 1} n^\gamma$, where $\gamma > 1$. Let us assume that $A_c, A_\infty \in \mathfrak{R}^{N+1}(\Pi_1(\mathfrak{C}); \eta)$, that $A_\infty > 0$ on $\Pi_1(\mathfrak{C})$, and that $A_c - A_\infty \in \mathcal{R}^{N+1}(c^{-2}; \Pi_1(\mathfrak{C}); \eta)$, where $\Pi_1(\mathfrak{C})$ is the projection of the set $\mathfrak{C}$ introduced at the beginning of Section 6 onto the first axis. Some omitted calculations show that Hypotheses 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 then hold, and that

$$R_c = e^{4\Phi/c^2} \mathfrak{R}_c(\eta, p) = \frac{m_0 P^{1/\gamma} e^{4\Phi/c^2(1-1/\gamma)}}{A_c^{1/\gamma}(\eta)} + \frac{P}{c^2(\gamma - 1)} \tag{6.3.21}$$

$$Q_c = \mathfrak{Q}_c(\eta, p, \Phi) = \gamma P \tag{6.3.22}$$

$$R_\infty = \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p) = \frac{m_0 p^{1/\gamma}}{A_\infty^{1/\gamma}(\eta)} \tag{6.3.23}$$

$$Q_\infty = \mathfrak{Q}_\infty(\eta, p) = \gamma p. \tag{6.3.24}$$

In the isentropic case $\eta(t, \mathbf{s}) \equiv \bar{\eta}$, (6.3.23) can be rewritten in the familiar form $p = C \cdot (R_\infty)^\gamma$, where C is a constant.

7. ENERGY CURRENTS

In this section we provide energy currents and discuss their two key properties: 1) for a fixed c, they are positive definite in the variations $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ when contracted against certain covectors, and 2) their divergence is lower order in the variations. In Section 8.3, we will see that the positivity property is uniform for all large c. A general framework for the construction of energy currents for hyperbolic systems derivable from a Lagrangian is developed in [6]. The role of energy currents is to replace the energy principle available for symmetric hyperbolic systems by providing integral identities, or more generally, integral inequalities, that enable one to control Sobolev norms of solutions[17] to the EOV_κ^c. This technique will be used in our proofs of Lemma 10-14 and Theorem 4.

7.1. The Definition of an Energy Current.

Given a variation $\dot{\mathbf{W}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^5$ and a BGS[18] $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{10}$ as defined in Section 5, we define the energy current to be the vectorfield ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ with components ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^0$, ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, in the global rectangular coordinate system given by

(7.1.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^0 &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \dot{\eta}^2 + \frac{\dot{P}^2}{\widetilde{Q}_c} + 2c^{-2}\widetilde{\gamma}_c^2(\widetilde{v}_k \dot{v}^k)\dot{P} + \widetilde{\gamma}_c^2(\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P})\left[\dot{v}_k \dot{v}^k + c^{-2}\widetilde{\gamma}_c^2(\widetilde{v}_k \dot{v}^k)^2\right] \\
{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^j &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \widetilde{v}^j \dot{\eta}^2 + \frac{\widetilde{v}^j}{\widetilde{Q}_c}\dot{P}^2 + 2\left[\dot{v}^j + c^{-2}\widetilde{\gamma}_c^2 \widetilde{v}^j \widetilde{v}_k \dot{v}^k\right]\dot{P} + \widetilde{\gamma}_c^2(\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P})\widetilde{v}^j\left[\dot{v}_k \dot{v}^k + c^{-2}\widetilde{\gamma}_c^2(\widetilde{v}_k \dot{v}^k)^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

In the case $c = \infty$, we define for $j = 1, 2, 3$:

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^0 &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \dot{\eta}^2 + \frac{\dot{p}^2}{\widetilde{Q}_\infty} + \widetilde{R}_\infty \dot{v}_k \dot{v}^k \\
{}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^j &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \widetilde{v}^j \dot{\eta}^2 + \frac{\widetilde{v}^j}{\widetilde{Q}_\infty}\dot{p}^2 + 2\dot{v}^j \dot{p} + \widetilde{R}_\infty \widetilde{v}^j \dot{v}_k \dot{v}^k.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.1.2}$$

We note that formally, $\lim_{c \to \infty} {}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}} = {}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$, a fact that will be rigorously justified in Section 8.3.

The energy current (7.1.1) is very closely related to the energy current $\dot{J}$ introduced in [18], where the following changes have been made. First, we have dropped the terms from $\dot{J}$ corresponding to the variations of the potential $\dot{\Phi}$ and its derivatives, for we will bound these terms in a Sobolev norm using a separate argument. Second, the expression for ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ is constructed using the velocity state-space variable $\mathbf{v}$ (3.2.11) and variations $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$, as opposed to the variables $U^j \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^\phi u^j$ and variations

---

[17] As we shall see, the energy currents ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ do not control the variations $\dot{\Phi}$ or $D\dot{\Phi}$; these terms are controlled through a separate argument that uses the lemmas in Appendix A.

[18] Recall that we also refer to $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ as the BGS when $c = \infty$.

$\dot{U}^j$ that appear in the expression for $\dot{J}$. Finally, we emphasize that the formula for ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\nu}$ applies in a rectangular coordinate system with $x^0 = t$, whereas in the formula for $\dot{J}^{\nu}$ provided in [18], the rectangular coordinate system is such that $x^0 = ct$, even though c was set equal to unity in [18].

Remark 7.1. Viewed as a quadratic form, ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{0}$ is manifestly positive definite in the variations $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ if $\widetilde{p} > 0$, for by our fundamental assumptions on the equation of state, $\widetilde{p} > 0 \implies \widetilde{R}_{\infty} > 0$ and $\widetilde{Q}_{\infty} > 0$.

7.2. The Positive Definiteness of $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{I}_x^{s*+}$.

As discussed in detail in [18], for ξ belonging to a certain subset of $T_x^*\mathcal{M}$, the quadratic form[19] $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$ is positive definite in $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ if $\widetilde{P} > 0$. The energy current $\dot{J}$ from [18] has the property that $\xi_{\mu}\dot{J}^{\mu}$ is a positive definite quadratic form in $\dot{\mathbf{V}}$ for ξ belonging to the interior of the positive component of the light cone in $T_x^*\mathcal{M}$. In contrast, since the energy current ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ from (7.1.1) does not contain terms involving the variations of the potential $\dot{\Phi}$, $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$ is positive definite in $(\dot{\eta}, \dot{P}, \dot{\mathbf{v}})$ for ξ belonging to $\mathcal{I}_x^{s*+}$, the interior of the positive component of the *sound* cone at x, which is *larger* than the light cone. Expressed in coordinates, this statement reads

$$\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}}) > 0 \text{ if } \dot{\mathbf{W}} > 0,\ \widetilde{P} > 0, \text{ and } \xi \in \mathcal{I}_x^{s*+}, \tag{7.2.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_x^{s*+} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\zeta \in T_x^*\mathcal{M} \mid (\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\zeta_{\mu}\zeta_{\nu} < 0 \text{ and } \zeta_0 > 0\}, \tag{7.2.2}$$

and $\widetilde{h}^{-1}$ is the *reciprocal acoustical metric*[20] with components that read (for $j, k = 1, 2, 3$)

$$\widetilde{h}^{00} = -c^{-2} - (\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\big[\mathfrak{S}_c^{-2}(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}) - c^{-2}\big] \tag{7.2.3}$$

$$\widetilde{h}^{0j} = \widetilde{h}^{j0} = -(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\big[\mathfrak{S}_c^{-2}(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}) - c^{-2}\big]\widetilde{v}^j \tag{7.2.4}$$

$$\widetilde{h}^{jk} = \delta^{jk} - (\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\big[\mathfrak{S}_c^{-2}(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}) - c^{-2}\big]\widetilde{v}^j\widetilde{v}^k \tag{7.2.5}$$

in the global rectangular coordinate system. Recall that the function $\mathfrak{S}_c$ is defined in 3.1.14.

We now further discuss the reciprocal acoustical metric. The characteristic subset[21] of the truncated[22] EOV_{κ}^{c} (5.0.8) - (5.0.10), which is a subset of $T_x^*\mathcal{M}$, the cotangent space at x, is the union of several sheets. The inner sheet is the sound cone at x, which is expressed in coordinates as $\{\zeta \in T_x^*\mathcal{M} \mid (\widetilde{h}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\zeta_{\mu}\zeta_{\nu} = 0\}$. It follows from the general construction of energy currents as presented in [6] that $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$ is positive definite whenever ξ belongs to the interior of the positive component of the inner sheet, which is exactly the condition expressed in (7.2.1). This fact allows us to use the form $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$ to estimate the L^2 norms of the variations $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$, provided that we estimate the BGS $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$.

As an alternative justification of the fact (7.2.1), we remark that ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ has the same form as an energy current which is shown to have the sound cone positivity property by Christodoulou [7], except that instead of using Christodoulou's rectangular coordinate system on $\mathcal{M}$ featuring $x^0 = t$, we are using here a rectangular coordinate system with $x^0 = ct$. In addition, we have expressed ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ using the Newtonian velocity $\mathbf{v}$ and its associated variations $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$, as opposed to Christodoulou's use of the four velocity and its variations.

Remark 7.2. Because $\lim_{c\to\infty}\mathfrak{S}_c^{-2}(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}) = \mathfrak{S}_{\infty}^{-2}(\widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{p}) > 0$, it follows that for all large c, the covector with coordinates $(1, 0, 0, 0)$ is an element of $\mathcal{I}_x^{s*+}$. Therefore, ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{0}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$ is positive definite for all large c.

---

[19] We write "$\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}})$" to emphasize the point of view that $\xi_{\mu}{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^{\mu}$ is a quadratic form in $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$.

[20] The reciprocal acoustical metric was introduced using dimensionless variables in [7].

[21] [18] contains a detailed discussion of the notion of the characteristic subset in the context of the $\text{EN}_{\kappa}^{c=1}$ system.

[22] By "truncated EOV_{κ}^{c}" we mean the system that results upon deleting the variable $\dot{\Phi}$ and the equation (5.0.11) that it satisfies.

7.3. **The Divergence of the Energy Current.**

As described in [18], if the variations $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ are solutions of the EOV^c_κ (5.0.8) - (5.0.10), then we can compute $\partial_\mu\left({}^{(c)}\dot{\jmath}^\mu\right)$ and use the equations (5.0.8) - (5.0.10) for substitution to eliminate the terms[23] containing the derivatives of $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$:

(7.3.1)
$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\mu\left({}^{(c)}\dot{\jmath}^\mu\right) &= \left[\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{Q}_c}\right) + \partial_j\left(\frac{\widetilde{v}^j}{\widetilde{Q}_c}\right)\right]\dot{P}^2 \\
&+ 2c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\dot{P}\dot{v}^k\left[\partial_t\widetilde{v}_k + \widetilde{v}_k\partial_j\widetilde{v}^j + \widetilde{v}^j\partial_j\widetilde{v}_k + 2c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\widetilde{v}_k\left(\widetilde{v}_j\partial_t\widetilde{v}^j + \widetilde{v}^j\widetilde{v}_a\partial_j\widetilde{v}^a\right)\right] \\
&+ \left\{\partial_t\left[(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\left(\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P}\right)\right] + \partial_j\left[(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2\left(\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P}\right)\widetilde{v}^j\right]\right\}\left[\dot{v}_k\dot{v}^k + c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2(\widetilde{v}_k\dot{v}^k)^2\right] \\
&+ 2c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^4\left[\widetilde{R}_c + c^{-2}\widetilde{P}\right]\left[\widetilde{v}_k\dot{v}^k\dot{v}^j\partial_t\widetilde{v}_j + \widetilde{v}_k\dot{v}^k\dot{v}^a\widetilde{v}^j\partial_j\widetilde{v}_a + c^{-2}(\widetilde{\gamma}_c)^2(\widetilde{v}_k\dot{v}^k)^2\left(\widetilde{v}_j\partial_t\widetilde{v}^j + \widetilde{v}_a\widetilde{v}^j\partial_j\widetilde{v}^a\right)\right] \\
&+ 2\dot{\eta}f + 2\frac{\dot{P}g}{\widetilde{Q}_c} + 2\dot{v}_j h^{(j)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We observe here that in the case $c = \infty$, (7.3.1) reduces to the more palatable expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\mu\left({}^{(\infty)}\dot{\jmath}^\mu\right) &= \left[\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{Q}_\infty}\right) + \partial_j\left(\frac{\widetilde{v}^j}{\widetilde{Q}_\infty}\right)\right]\dot{p}^2 + \left\{\partial_t\left(\widetilde{R}_\infty\right) + \partial_j\left(\widetilde{R}_\infty\widetilde{v}^j\right)\right\}\dot{v}_k\dot{v}^k \\
&+ 2\dot{\eta}f + 2\frac{\dot{P}g}{\widetilde{Q}_\infty} + 2\dot{v}_j h^{(j)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.3.2}$$

8. ASSUMPTIONS ON THE INITIAL DATA AND THE UNIFORM-IN-c POSITIVITY OF ENERGY CURRENTS

In this section we describe a class of initial data for which our energy methods allow us to rigorously take the limit $c \to \infty$ in the EN^c_κ system. The Cauchy surface we consider is $\{(t, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{M} \mid t = 0\}$.

8.1. **An H^N Perturbation of a Quiet Fluid.**

Initial data for the EP_κ system are denoted by

$$\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty(\mathbf{s}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p}, \mathring{v}^1, \mathring{v}^2, \mathring{v}^3, \mathring{\Phi}_\infty, \mathring{\Psi}_0, \mathring{\Psi}_1, \mathring{\Psi}_2, \mathring{\Psi}_3), \tag{8.1.1}$$

where $\mathring{\Psi}_0(\mathbf{s}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_t\Phi(0, \mathbf{s})$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_j \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_j\mathring{\Phi}_\infty(\mathbf{s})$. We assume that $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ is an H^N perturbation of the constant state $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$, where

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\bar{\eta}, \bar{p}, 0, 0, 0, \bar{\Phi}_\infty, 0, 0, 0, 0), \tag{8.1.2}$$

$\bar{\eta}, \bar{p}$ are positive constants, and the constant $\bar{\Phi}_\infty$ is the unique solution to

$$\kappa^2\bar{\Phi}_\infty + 4\pi G\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta}, \bar{p}) = 0. \tag{8.1.3}$$

The constraint (8.1.3) must be satisfied in order for equation (4.2.4) to be satisfied by $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$. By an H^N perturbation, we mean that

$$\|\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty\|_{H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty}} < \infty, \tag{8.1.4}$$

where we use the notation $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty$ to refer to the first 5 components of $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ respectively. *We emphasize that a further positivity restriction on the initial data $\mathring{p}$ and $\mathring{\eta}$ is introduced in Section 8.2, and that throughout this article, N is a fixed integer satisfying*

$$N \geq 4. \tag{8.1.5}$$

Remark 8.1. We require $N \geq 4$ so that Corollary B-3 and Remark B.1 can be applied to conclude that $\partial_t^2 l \in C^0([0, T], H^{N-2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, where l is defined in (10.2.10); this is a necessary hypothesis for Proposition A-5, which we use in our proof of Theorem 2.

---

[23] Showing this via a calculation is an arduous task. The lower-order divergence property is a generic feature of energy currents constructed in the manner described in [6], but we require its explicit form in order to analyze its $c-$dependence.

Although we refer to $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_\nu,\ \nu = 0,1,2,3,$ as "data," in the EP_κ system, these 5 quantities are determined by $\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p},\mathring{v}^1,\mathring{v}^2,\mathring{v}^3$ through the equations (4.2.2'), (4.2.4), and (8.1.3), together with vanishing conditions at infinity on $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_0$:

$$\Delta\mathring{\Phi}_\infty - \kappa^2(\mathring{\Phi}_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty) = 4\pi G\big[\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p}) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta},\bar{p})\big] \tag{8.1.6}$$

$$\Delta\mathring{\Psi}_0 - \kappa^2\mathring{\Psi}_0 = -4\pi G\partial_t|_{t=0}\big(\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p)\big) = -4\pi G\partial_k\big(\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\big), \tag{8.1.7}$$

where the integral kernel from (4.2.7) can be used to compute $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_0$. We will nevertheless refer to the array $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ as the "data" for the EP_κ system.

Remark 8.2. Remark 4.1 implies that $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty \in H^{N+2}_{\bar{\Phi}_\infty}$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_\infty \in H^{N+1}$.

We now construct data for the EN_κ^c system from $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$. Depending on which set of state-space variables we are working with, we denote the data for the EN_κ^c system by

$$\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p},\mathring{v}^1,\mathring{v}^2,\mathring{v}^3,\mathring{\Phi}_c,\mathring{\Psi}_0,\mathring{\Psi}_1,\mathring{\Psi}_2,\mathring{\Psi}_3) \tag{8.1.8}$$

$$\text{or } \mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\mathring{\eta},e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2}\mathring{p},\mathring{v}^1,\mathring{v}^2,\mathring{v}^3,\mathring{\Phi}_c,\mathring{\Psi}_0,\mathring{\Psi}_1,\mathring{\Psi}_2,\mathring{\Psi}_3), \tag{8.1.9}$$

where unlike in the EP_κ case, $\mathring{\Phi}_c,\mathring{\Psi}_0,\mathring{\Psi}_1,\mathring{\Psi}_2,$ and $\mathring{\Psi}_3$ are data in the sense that the system is underdetermined if they are not prescribed. We have chosen the data $\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p},\mathring{v}^1,\mathring{v}^2,\mathring{v}^3,\mathring{\Psi}_0,\mathring{\Psi}_1,\mathring{\Psi}_2,\mathring{\Psi}_3$ for the EN_κ^c system to be the same as the data for the EP_κ system, but for technical reasons described below and indicated in (8.1.12) and (8.1.14), our requirement that there exists a constant background state typically constrains the datum $\mathring{\Phi}_c$ so that it differs from $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty$ by a small constant that vanishes as $c \to \infty$.

As in the EP_κ system, we assume that $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ is an H^N perturbation of the constant state of the form (depending on which collection of state-space variables we are working with)

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\bar{\eta},\bar{p},0,0,0,\bar{\Phi}_c,0,0,0,0) \tag{8.1.10}$$

$$\text{or } \bar{\mathbf{V}}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\bar{\eta},\bar{P}_c,0,0,0,\bar{\Phi}_c,0,0,0,0) \tag{8.1.11}$$

where $\bar{\eta}$ and $\bar{p}$ are the same constants appearing in $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$, $\bar{\Phi}_c$ is the unique solution to

$$\kappa^2\bar{\Phi}_c + 4\pi G e^{4c^{-2}\bar{\Phi}_c}\big[\mathfrak{R}_c(\bar{\eta},\bar{p}) - 3c^{-2}\bar{p}\big] = 0, \tag{8.1.12}$$

and $\bar{P}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^{4c^{-2}\bar{\Phi}_c}\bar{p}$. The constraint (8.1.12) must be satisfied in order for equation (4.1.4) to be satisfied by $\bar{p},\bar{\eta},$ and $\bar{\Phi}_c$. Although the background potential $\bar{\Phi}_c$ for the EN_κ^c system is not in general equal to the background potential $\bar{\Phi}_\infty$ for the EP_κ system, it follows from the hypotheses (6.3.1) and (6.3.2) on the c-dependence of $\mathfrak{R}_c$ that

$$\lim_{c\to\infty}\bar{\Phi}_c = \bar{\Phi}_\infty. \tag{8.1.13}$$

We now define the initial datum $\mathring{\Phi}_c$ appearing in the arrays (8.1.8) and (8.1.9) by

$$\mathring{\Phi}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathring{\Phi}_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty + \bar{\Phi}_c, \tag{8.1.14}$$

which ensures that the deviation of $\mathring{\Phi}_c$ from the background potential $\bar{\Phi}_c$ matches the deviation of $\mathring{\Phi}_\infty$ from the background potential $\bar{\Phi}_\infty$. We denote the first 5 components of $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$, $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$, and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ by $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_c,\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c,\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_c,$ and $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_c$ respectively.

Remark 8.3. We could weaken the hypotheses by allowing the initial data for the EN_κ^c system to deviate from the initial data for the EP_κ system by an H^N perturbation that decays to 0 rapidly enough as $c \to \infty$. For simplicity, we will not pursue this analysis here.

8.2. **The Sets $\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}_2,\mathfrak{O}_2,\mathfrak{C},K,$ and $\mathfrak{K}$.**

In order to avoid studying the free boundary problem, and in order to avoid singularities in the energy currents (7.1.1) and (7.1.2), we assume that the initial pressure, energy density, and speed of sound are uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant. According to our assumptions (3.1.11) on the equation of state, to achieve this uniform bound, it is sufficient to make the following further assumption on the initial data: that $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is contained in a compact subset of the following open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of the state-space $\mathbb{R}^5$, the *admissible subset of truncated state-space*, defined by

$$\mathcal{O} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \big\{\mathscr{W} = (\eta, p, v^1, v^2, v^3) \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid \eta > 0, p > 0\big\}. \tag{8.2.1}$$

Therefore, we assume that $\mathring{\mathscr{W}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathcal{O}_1$ and $\bar{\mathscr{W}}_\infty \in \mathcal{O}_1$, where $\mathcal{O}_1$ is a precompact open set with $\mathcal{O}_1 \Subset \mathcal{O}$, and " $\Subset$ " means that "the closure is compact and contained in the interior of." We then fix convex precompact open subsets $\mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathfrak{D}_2$ with $\mathcal{O}_1 \Subset \mathcal{O}_2 \Subset \mathfrak{D}_2 \Subset \mathcal{O}$, and define $\mathfrak{C}$ to be the projection of $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$ onto the first two axes, where $\bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$ denotes the closure of $\mathfrak{D}_2$. We assume that with this definition[24] of $\mathfrak{C}$, hypotheses (6.3.1) and (6.3.2) are satisfied by the equation of state. Consequently, property (8.1.13) shows that for all large c including $c = \infty$, $\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \Subset \mathcal{O}_2$ and $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_c \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{O}_2)$; also note that for all c, $\mathring{\mathscr{W}}_c = \mathring{\mathscr{W}}_\infty = \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_\infty$.

We now address the variables $\big(\Phi, \partial_t\Phi, \partial_1\Phi, \partial_2\Phi, \partial_3\Phi\big)$. In Section 10, we will use energy estimates to prove the existence of an interval $[0, T]$ and a cube of the form $[-a, a]^5$ such that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we have $\big(\Phi, \partial_t\Phi, \partial_1\Phi, \partial_2\Phi, \partial_3\Phi\big)([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset [-a, a]^5$. Furthermore, it will follow from the discussion in Section 10 that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we have $\big(\mathring{\Phi}_c, \mathring{\Psi}_0, \mathring{\Psi}_1, \mathring{\Psi}_2, \mathring{\Psi}_3\big)(\mathbb{R}^3) \Subset \text{Int}([-a, a]^5)$. The compact convex set K, then, as given in (10.2.25) below, will be defined to be $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5$. It follows from the above discussion that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we have $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \Subset \text{Int}(K)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c \in \text{Int}(K)$. Our goal is to show that the solution $\mathbf{V}_c$ to (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) launched by the initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ exists on a time interval $[0, T]$ that is independent of (all large) c and remains in K.

We now discuss the simple construction of $\mathfrak{K}$: based on the above construction, it follows from definitions (5.0.12) - (5.0.15) that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we have $\mathbf{V} \in K \implies \mathscr{W} \in \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2$. As given in (10.2.26), we will then define the compact convex[25] set $\mathfrak{K}$ by $\mathfrak{K} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5$, so that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we also have $\mathbf{V} \in K \implies \mathscr{V} \in \mathfrak{K}$. As in the previous discussion, it follows that for all large c including $c = \infty$, we have $\mathring{\mathscr{V}}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \Subset \text{Int}(\mathfrak{K})$ and $\bar{\mathscr{V}}_c \in \text{Int}(\mathfrak{K})$.

8.3. The Uniform-in-c Positive Definiteness of ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0$.

As mentioned at the beginning of Section 7, we will use the quantity $\|{}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0(t)\|_{L^1}$ to control $\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}(t)\|^2_{H^N}$, where ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ is an energy current for the variation $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ with coefficients defined by a BGS $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$. Since we seek estimates that are uniform in c, it is important that ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0$ is uniformly positive definite in $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ independent of both the BGS $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ and all large c. Let us now formulate this precisely as a lemma.

Lemma 8-1. *Let* ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ *be the energy current* (7.1.1) *for the variation* $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ *defined by the BGS* $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$. *Assume that* $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$, *where* $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$ *is defined in Section 8.2, and furthermore assume that* $|\widetilde{\Phi}(t, \mathbf{s})| \leq Z$. *Then there exists a constant* $C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, Z}$ *with* $0 < C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, Z} < 1$ *such that*

$$C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, Z}|\dot{\mathbf{W}}|^2 \leq {}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \dot{\mathbf{W}}) \leq C^{-1}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, Z}|\dot{\mathbf{W}}|^2 \tag{8.3.1}$$

holds for all large c including $c = \infty$.

Proof. It is sufficient prove inequality (8.3.1) when $|\dot{\mathbf{W}}| = 1$ since it is invariant under any re-scaling of $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathscr{W}}, \widetilde{\mathscr{V}}$ be the arrays related to the arrays $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ as defined in (5.0.12) - (5.0.15). Our assumptions imply the existence of a compact set $\mathfrak{D}$ depending only on $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$ and Z such that for all large c, $\widetilde{\mathscr{V}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathfrak{D}$.

Recall that ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ is defined in (7.1.2) and that ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0$ is manifestly positive definite in the variations[26] $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ if $\widetilde{p} > 0$. If we view ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0$ as a function of $(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \widetilde{\mathscr{W}})$, then by uniform continuity, there is a constant $0 < C(\mathfrak{D}) < 1$ such that $C(\mathfrak{D})|\dot{\mathbf{W}}|^2 \leq {}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0 \leq C(\mathfrak{D})^{-1}|\dot{\mathbf{W}}|^2$ holds on the compact set $\{|\dot{\mathbf{W}}| = 1\} \times \Pi_5(\mathfrak{D})$, where $\Pi_5(\mathfrak{D})$ is the projection of $\mathfrak{D}$ onto the first five axes. Furthermore, if we also view ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}^0$ as a function of $(\dot{\mathbf{W}}, \widetilde{\mathscr{V}})$, then by Lemma 6-2, Lemma 6-5, (7.1.1), and (7.1.2) we have that ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathcal{J}}^0 = {}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathcal{J}}^0 + \mathfrak{F}_c \cdot |\dot{\mathbf{W}}|^2$, where $\mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{R}^N(c^{-2};\mathfrak{D};\widetilde{\mathcal{V}})$. (8.3.1) now easily follows: $C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}$ can be any positive number that is strictly smaller than $C(\mathfrak{D})$. $\square$

---

[24] Note that our construction of $\mathfrak{D}_2$ depends on $\mathring{\mathscr{W}}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, but is *independent* of the equation of state and *independent* of c.

[25] Proposition B-4 requires the convexity of K and $\mathfrak{K}$, and the estimate (B.33) also requires that $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c \in K$, $\bar{\mathscr{V}} \in \mathfrak{K}$. In practice, K and $\mathfrak{K}$ can be chosen to be cubes.

[26] To be consistent the notation used in formula (7.1.2), it would be "more correct" to use the symbol $\dot{\mathscr{W}}$ to denote the variations appearing as arguments in ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}(\cdot, \cdot)$. However, for the purposes of this proof, there is no harm in identifying $\dot{\mathbf{W}} = \dot{\mathscr{W}}$ since in this context, these placeholder variables merely represent the arguments of ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ when viewed as a quadratic form in the variations.

9. Smoothing the Initial Data

For technical reasons, we need to smooth the initial data. Without smoothing, the terms on the right-hand sides of (10.2.4) - (10.2.6) involving the derivatives of the initial data could be unbounded in the H^N norm. To begin, we fix a Friedrichs mollifier $\chi(\mathbf{s})$; i.e., $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\chi) \subset \{\mathbf{s}|\ |\mathbf{s}| \leq 1\}, \chi \geq 0$, and $\int \chi\ d^3\mathbf{s} = 1$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we set $\chi_\epsilon(\mathbf{s}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon^{-3}\chi(\frac{\mathbf{s}}{\epsilon})$. We smooth the first 5 components $\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$ of the data $\mathring{\mathcal{V}}_\infty$ defined in (8.1.1) with χ_ϵ, defining $\chi_\epsilon\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty \in C^\infty$ by

$$\chi_\epsilon\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty(\mathbf{s}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_\epsilon(\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{s}')\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty(\mathbf{s}')\, d^3\mathbf{s}'. \tag{9.0.2}$$

Note that we do not smooth the data $(\mathring{\Phi}_c, \mathring{\Psi}_0) \in H^{N+2}_{\bar{\Phi}_c} \times H^{N+1}$ because by Remark 8.2 and definition (8.1.14), they already have sufficient regularity.

The following property of such a mollification is well known:

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \|\chi_\epsilon\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty - \mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty\|_{H^N} = 0. \tag{9.0.3}$$

We will choose below an $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Once chosen, we define

$${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathcal{W}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left({}^{(0)}\mathring{\eta}, {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}, {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{v}}\right) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \chi_{\epsilon_0}\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\infty \tag{9.0.4}$$

$${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left({}^{(0)}\mathring{\eta}, e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2} \cdot {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}, {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{v}}\right), \tag{9.0.5}$$

where $\mathring{\Phi}_c$ is defined in (8.1.14). By Sobolev embedding, the assumptions on the initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c$, which are the first 5 components of the data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ defined in (8.1.9), by Lemma 6-2, by (6.3.5), and by the mollification property (9.0.3), $\exists\{\Lambda_1 > 0 \wedge \epsilon_0 > 0\}$ such that

$$\text{for all large } c,\ \|\mathbf{W} - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c\|_{H^N} \leq \Lambda_1 \Rightarrow \mathbf{W} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2 \tag{9.0.6}$$

$$\|{}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c - \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c\|_{H^N} \lesssim C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z} \cdot \frac{\Lambda_1}{2}, \tag{9.0.7}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$ is defined in Section 8.2, and $C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}$ is the constant from (8.3.1). Here, Z is a fixed constant that will serve as an upper bound for $\|\Phi(t)\|_{L^\infty}$ on a certain time interval, where Φ will be a solution variable to the EN^c_κ system. We explain this fixed value of Z, given in expression (10.3.5) below, in detail in Section 10.3. Note that according to this reasoning, $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_1(\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2; Z)$.

Remark 9.1. Because these quantities enter into our Sobolev estimates below, it is an important fact that $\|{}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c\|_{H^{N+1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}}$ and $\|{}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c\|_{L^\infty}$ are uniformly bounded for all large c. By (8.1.13), (8.1.14), definition (9.0.5), and Sobolev embedding, to obtain these uniform bounds, we only need to show that $\|\ e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2} \cdot {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}\ \|_{H^{N+1}_{e^{4\bar{\Phi}_c/c^2}\bar{p}}}$ is uniformly bounded for all large c. This fact follows from Lemma 6-1, Lemma 6-2, and (6.3.5). Such a uniform bound is used, for example, in the estimate (10.3.45).

10. Uniform-in-Time Local Existence for EN^c_κ

In this section we prove our first important theorem, namely that there is a uniform time interval $[0,T]$ on which solutions to the EN^c_κ system having the initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ exist, as long as c is large enough. We emphasize that throughout this article, we assume that $N \geq 4$ and that the equation of state satisfies the hypotheses (6.3.1), (6.3.2).

10.1. **Local Existence and Uniqueness for EN^c_κ Revisited.**

Let us first recall the following local existence result proved in [18], in which it was not yet shown that the time interval of existence can be chosen independently of all large c.

Theorem 1. (EN^c_κ Local Existence Revisited) *Let* $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbf{s})$ *be initial data* (8.1.8) *for the* EN^c_κ *system* (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) *that are subject to the conditions described in Section 8. Assume that the equation of state is "physical" as described in Section 3.1. Then for all large (finite) c, there exists a* $T_c > 0$ *such that* (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) *has a unique classical solution* $\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0,T_c] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ *of* *the form* $\mathbf{V} = (\eta, P, v^1, v^2, v^3, \Phi, \partial_t\Phi, \partial_1\Phi, \partial_2\Phi, \partial_3\Phi)$ *with* $\mathbf{V}(0,\mathbf{s}) = \mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbf{s})$*. The solution satisfies* $\mathbf{V}([0,T_c]\times\mathbb{R}^3) \subset K$*, where the (c−independent) compact set K is defined in equation* (10.2.25)*. Furthermore,* $\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T_c], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T_c], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^2([0,T_c], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c})$ *and* $\Phi \in C^0([0,T_c], H^{N+1}_{\bar{\Phi}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T_c], H^{N}_{\bar{\Phi}_c}) \cap C^2([0,T_c], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\Phi}_c}) \cap C^3([0,T_c], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\Phi}_c})$*, where the constants* $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ *and* $\bar{\Phi}_c$ *are defined by* (8.1.11) *and* (8.1.12) *respectively.*

Remark 10.1. Although they are not explicitly proved in [18], the facts that $\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0,T_c]\times\mathbb{R}^3)$ and that $\mathbf{V}$ is twice differentiable in t as a map from $[0,T_c]$ to $H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}$ follow from our assumption that $N \geq 4$ (i.e. the degree of differentiability of the solution is $N-2$). Also, by Corollary B-3, we have that $p \in C^0([0,T_c], H^N_{\bar{p}}) \cap C^1([0,T_c], H^{N-1}_{\bar{p}}) \cap C^2([0,T_c], H^{N-2}_{\bar{p}})$, since $p = Pe^{-4\Phi/c^2}$.

The proof of the claim that T_c can be chosen such that $\mathbf{V}([0,T_c]\times\mathbb{R}^3) \subset K$ is based on the fact $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbb{R}^3) \Subset \text{Int}(K)$, which follows from the remaining discussion in this section, together with the continuity result from the theorem and Sobolev embedding.

Remark 10.2. The case $c = \infty$ is discussed separately in Theorem 3.

Remark 10.3. The local existence theorem in [18] was proved using the relativistic state-space variables $U^\nu \overset{\text{def}}{=} e^\phi u^\nu$. However, the form of the Newtonian change of variables made in sections 3.1 and 3.2, together with Corollary B-3, allow us to conclude Sobolev regularity in one set of variables if the same regularity is known in the other set of variables.

The following corollary, which slightly extends the lifespan of the solution and also allows us to conclude stronger regularity properties from weaker regularity properties, will soon be used in our proof of Proposition 10-2.

Corollary 10-1. *Assume that* $5/2 < N' < N$ *and that* $\mathbf{V}(t,\mathbf{s})$ *is a solution to the* EN^c_κ *system having the regularity property* $\mathbf{V} \in L^\infty([0,T], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^3)$*. Then there exists an* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that (with* $T^+ \overset{def}{=} T + \epsilon$*)*

$$\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0,T^+]\times\mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T^+], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T^+], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^2([0,T^+], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}). \tag{10.1.1}$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 1 to conclude[27] that for each $T' \in [0,T]$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, depending on T', and a solution $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ to the EN^c_κ system such that $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \in C^2([T'-\epsilon, T'+\epsilon]\times\mathbb{R}^3)$ $\cap C^0([T'-\epsilon, T'+\epsilon], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([T'-\epsilon, T'+\epsilon], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^2([T'-\epsilon, T'+\epsilon], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c})$ and such that $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}(T') = \mathbf{V}(T')$. Furthermore, the uniqueness argument from [18], which is based on local energy estimates, can be easily modified to show that solutions to the EN^c_κ system are unique in the class $C^1([T'-\epsilon, T'+\epsilon]\times\mathbb{R}^3)$. Therefore $\mathbf{V} \equiv \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}$ on their common slab of spacetime existence. Corollary 10-1 thus follows. □

In addition to Theorem 1, our proof of Theorem 2 also requires an additional key ingredient, namely a continuation principle for Sobolev norm-bounded solutions:

Proposition 10-2. ***(Continuation Principle)*** *Let* $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbf{s})$ *be initial data* (8.1.8) *for the* EN^c_κ *system* (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) *that are subject to the conditions described in Section 8, and let* $T > 0$*. Assume that* $\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T), H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T), H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c})$ *is the unique classical solution existing on* $[0,T)$ *launched by* $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbf{s})$*. Let* $\mathcal{O}$ *be the admissible subset of truncated state-space defined in* (8.2.1)*, and let* $\Pi_5 : \mathbb{R}^{10} \to \mathbb{R}^5$ *be the projection onto the first* 5 *axes. Assume that there are constants* $M_1, M_2 > 0$*, a compact set* $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{10}$ *with* $\Pi_5(K) \Subset \mathcal{O}$*, and a set* $U \Subset$ *Int*(K) *such that the following three estimates hold for any* $T' \in [0,T)$ *:*

(1) $|||\, \mathbf{V} \,|||_{H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c},T'} \leq M_1$
(2) $|||\, \partial_t\mathbf{V} \,|||_{H^{N-1},T'} \leq M_2$
(3) $\mathbf{V}([0,T']\times\mathbb{R}^3) \subset U.$

Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ *such that (with* $T^+ \overset{def}{=} T + \epsilon$*)*

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0,T^+]\times\mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T^+], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T^+], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^2([0,T^+], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \\ \textit{and} \;\; \mathbf{V}([0,T^+]\times\mathbb{R}^3) \subset K.\end{gathered} \tag{10.1.2}$$

---

[27] Theorem 1 can be easily modified to obtain a solution that exists both “forward” and “backward” in time.

Remark 10.4. Hypothesis (2) is redundant; it can be deduced from hypothesis (1) by using the equations to solve for $\partial_t \mathbf{V}$ and then applying (B.30).

Proof. We will first show that there exists a $\mathbf{V}^* \in H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\mathbf{V}(T_n) - \mathbf{V}^*\|_{H^{N-1}} = 0 \tag{10.1.3}$$

holds for any sequence $\{T_n\}$ of time values converging to T from below.

If $\{T_n\}$ is such a sequence, then hypothesis (2) implies that $\|\mathbf{V}(T_j) - \mathbf{V}(T_k)\|_{H^{N-1}} \leq M_2|T_j - T_k|$. By the completeness of H^{N-1}, there exists a $\mathbf{V}^* \in H^{N-1}_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}$ such that (10.1.3) holds, and it is easy to check that $\mathbf{V}^*$ does not depend on the sequence $\{T_n\}$. By hypothesis (1), we also have that $\{\mathbf{V}(T_n)\}$ converges weakly in $H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}$ to $\mathbf{V}^*$ and that $\|\mathbf{V}^*\|_{H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}} \leq M_1$. We now fix a number N' with $5/2 < N' < N$. By Proposition B-6, we have that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\mathbf{V}(T_n) - \mathbf{V}^*\|_{H^{N'}} = 0$. Consequently, if we define $\mathbf{V}(T) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{V}^*$, it follows that $\mathbf{V} \in L^\infty([0,T], H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \cap C^0([0,T], H^{N'}_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c})$. Using the fact that $N' > 5/2$, together with the embedding of $H^{N'}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ into appropriate Hölder spaces, it can be shown that $\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T], H^{N'}_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}) \implies \mathbf{V}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$; i.e., we can continuously extend $\mathbf{V}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{V}$ to the slab $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$. To conclude that $\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, we will show that $\partial_t \mathbf{V}$ extends continuously to $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$. To this end, we use the $\text{EN}^{\text{c}}_\kappa$ equations to solve for $\partial_t \mathbf{V}$:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{V} = \mathfrak{F}(\mathbf{V}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{V}), \tag{10.1.4}$$

where $\mathfrak{F} \in C^N$. Since $\mathbf{V}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, the right-hand side of (10.1.4) has been shown to extend continuously so that it is an element of $C^0([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. Furthermore, since $\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, it follows from elementary analysis that $\partial_t \mathbf{V}$ exists classically on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and that $\partial_t \mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, thus implying that $\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. The additional conclusions in (10.1.2) now follow from Corollary 10-1 and continuity. ☐

Remark 10.5. Proposition 10-2 shows that if the solution $\mathbf{V}$ blows up at time T, then either $\lim_{T'\uparrow T} ||| \mathbf{V} |||_{H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c},T'} = \infty$, $\lim_{T'\uparrow T} ||| \partial_t \mathbf{V} |||_{H^{N-1},T'} = \infty$, or $\mathbf{V}(T', \mathbb{R}^3)$ escapes every compact subset of $\mathcal{O} \times R^5$ as $T' \uparrow T$, where $\mathcal{O}$ is defined in (8.2.1).

Remark 10.6. Although the main theorems in this article require that $N \geq 4$, Corollary 10-1 and Proposition 10-2 are also valid for $N = 3$, except that the conclusion $\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0, T + \epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ must be replaced with $\mathbf{V} \in C^1([0, T + \epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, and the conclusion $\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0, T + \epsilon], H^{N-2}_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c})$ does not hold.

10.2. **The Uniform-in-Time Local Existence Theorem.**

We now state and prove the uniform time of existence theorem.

Theorem 2. (Uniform Time of Existence) *Let $\mathring{\mathcal{V}}_\infty$ denote initial data (8.1.1) for the EP_κ system (4.2.1) - (4.2.6) that are subject to the conditions described in Section 8. Let $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ denote the corresponding initial data (8.1.9) for the $\text{EN}^{\text{c}}_\kappa$ system (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) constructed from $\mathring{\mathcal{V}}_\infty$ as described in Section 8, and let ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c$ denote the smoothing (9.0.5) of the first 5 components of $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ as described in Section 9. Assume that the $c-$indexed equation of state satisfies the hypotheses (6.3.1) and (6.3.2) and is "physical" as described in sections 3.1 and 6.3, and let K be the fixed compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{10}$ defined in (10.2.25). Then there exist $c_0 > 0$ and $T > 0$, with T not depending on c, such that for $c \geq c_0$, $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ launches a unique classical solution $\mathbf{V}$ to (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) that exists on the slab $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and that has the properties $\mathbf{V}(0, \mathbf{s}) = \mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c(\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbf{V}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset K$. The solution is of the form $\mathbf{V} = (\eta, P, v^1, v^2, v^3, \Phi, \partial_t\Phi, \partial_1\phi, \partial_2\Phi, \partial_3\Phi)$ and has the regularity properties $\mathbf{V} \in C^2([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T], H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1([0,T], H^{N-1}_{\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and $\Phi \in C^3([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T], H^{N+1}_{\mathring{\Phi}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1([0,T], H^N_{\mathring{\Phi}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^2([0,T], H^{N-1}_{\mathring{\Phi}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, where the* *constants* $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c$ *and* $\bar{\Phi}_c$ *are defined by* (8.1.11) *and* (8.1.12) *respectively. Furthermore, with* $p \overset{def}{=} Pe^{-4\phi/c^2}$, *there exist constants* $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4 > 0$ *such that*

$$|||\ \mathbf{W} - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c\ |||_{H^N,T} \lesssim \Lambda_1 \tag{10.2.1a}$$

$$|||\ \Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c\ |||_{H^{N+1},T} \lesssim \Lambda_2 \tag{10.2.1b}$$

$$|||\ \partial_t \mathbf{W}\ |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim L_1 \tag{10.2.1c}$$

$$|||\ \partial_t \Phi\ |||_{H^N,T} \lesssim L_2 \tag{10.2.1d}$$

$$|||\ \partial_t^2 \eta\ |||_{H^{N-2},T},\ \ |||\ \partial_t^2 p\ |||_{H^{N-2},T} \lesssim L_3 \tag{10.2.1e}$$

$$c^{-1}\ |||\ \partial_t^2 \Phi\ |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim L_4. \tag{10.2.1f}$$

10.2.1. *Outline of the structure of the proof of Theorem 2.* We prove Theorem 2 via the method of continuous induction ("bootstrapping"). After defining the constants $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2'$, and L_4, we make the assumptions (10.3.1) - (10.3.4). These assumptions hold at $\tau = 0$ and therefore, by Theorem 1, there exists an interval $\tau \in [0, T_c)$ on which the solution exists and on which the assumptions hold. Based on these estimates, we use a collection of technical lemmas derived from energy estimates to conclude that the bounds (10.2.17) - (10.2.23) hold for $\tau \in [0, T_c)$. It is important that the constants appearing on the right-hand sides of (10.2.17) - (10.2.23) do not depend on c, if c is large enough. We can therefore apply Proposition 10-2 to conclude that for all large c, the solution can be extended to a uniform interval $[0, T]$. The closing of the induction argument is largely due to the fact that the source term for the Klein-Gordon equation satisfied by Φ, which is the right-hand side of (4.1.4), "depends on Φ only through $c^{-2}\Phi$."

10.2.2. *Proof of Theorem 2.* We begin our detailed proof of Theorem 2 by making a few remarks about the running constants $C(\cdots)$ that will appear in our argument. For the sake of appearances, we frequently suppress the dependence of $C(\cdots)$ on N, κ, and the sets $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, \bar{\mathfrak{O}}_2, K$, and $\mathfrak{K}$. We indicate dependence of the running constants on the initial data $\|{}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c\|_{H^{N+1}_{\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c}}$, $\|\mathring{\Phi}_c\|_{H^{N+1}_{\mathring{\Phi}_c}}$, and $\|\mathring{\Psi}_0\|_{H^N}$ by writing $C(id)$. By Remark 9.1, any constant $C(id)$ can be chosen to be independent of all large c.

We now introduce some notation that will be used throughout the proof, and also in the following section, where we have placed the proofs of the technical lemmas. Let $\mathbf{V}$ denote the local in time solution to the EN_κ^c system (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) launched by the initial data $\mathring{\mathbf{V}}_c$ as furnished by Theorem 1. With $\mathbf{W}$ denoting the first 5 components of $\mathbf{V}$, we suggestively define

$$\dot{\mathbf{W}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{W}(t, \mathbf{s}) - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbf{s}) \tag{10.2.2}$$

$$\dot{\Phi} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c, \tag{10.2.3}$$

where $\mathring{\Phi}_c$ is defined in (8.1.14) and ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbf{s})$ is defined in (9.0.5) with the help of (10.3.5). We remark that this choice of ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbf{s})$ is explained in more detail below.

It follows from the fact that $\mathbf{W}$ is a solution to (4.1.1) - (4.1.3) that $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ is a solution to the EOV_κ^c (5.0.8) - (5.0.10) defined by the BGS $\mathbf{V}$ with initial data $\dot{\mathbf{W}}(0, \mathbf{s}) = \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbf{s}) - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c(\mathbf{s})$. The inhomogeneous terms in the EOV_κ^c satisfied by $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ are given by $\mathbf{b} = (f, g, \cdots, h^{(3)})$, where for $j = 1, 2, 3$

$$f = -v^k \partial_k [{}^{(0)}\mathring{\eta}] \tag{10.2.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} g = {} & (4P - 3Q_c)[\partial_t(c^{-2}\Phi) + v^k \partial_k (c^{-2}\Phi)] - v^k \partial_k [e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2} \cdot {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}] \\ & - Q_c \partial_k [{}^{(0)}\mathring{v}^k] - c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 Q_c v^k v_a \partial_k [{}^{(0)}\mathring{v}^a] \end{aligned} \tag{10.2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h^{(j)} = {} & \big(3c^{-2}P - R_c\big)\big(\partial_j \Phi + (\gamma_c)^{-2} v^j [\partial_t(c^{-2}\Phi) + v^k \partial_k (c^{-2}\Phi)]\big) \\ & - (\gamma_c)^2 (R_c + c^{-2}P)\big(v^k \partial_k [{}^{(0)}\mathring{v}^j] + c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^j v_k v^a \partial_a [{}^{(0)}\mathring{v}^k]\big) \\ & - \partial_j [e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2} \cdot {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}] - c^{-2}(\gamma_c)^2 v^j v^k \partial_k [e^{4\mathring{\Phi}_c/c^2} \cdot {}^{(0)}\mathring{p}]. \end{aligned} \tag{10.2.6}$$

In order to show that the hypotheses of Proposition 10-2 are satisfied, we will need to estimate $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}} \dot{\mathbf{W}}$ in L^2. Therefore, we study the equation that $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}} \dot{\mathbf{W}}$ satisfies: for $0 \leq |\vec{\alpha}| \leq N$, we differentiate the EOV_κ^c defined by the BGS $\mathbf{V}$ with inhomogeneous terms $\mathbf{b}$ to which $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ is a solution, obtaining that $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ satisfies[28]

$$ {}_c\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\partial_\mu\big(\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}\big) = \mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}, \tag{10.2.7}$$

where (suppressing the dependence of the ${}_c\mathcal{A}^\nu(\cdot)$ on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and Φ)

$$\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}_c\mathcal{A}^0\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\left(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}\right) + \mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}} \tag{10.2.8}$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}_c\mathcal{A}^0\left[({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k(\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}) - \partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\big(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k\dot{\mathbf{W}}\big)\right]. \tag{10.2.9}$$

Thus, each $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ is a solution the EOV_κ^c defined by the *same* BGS $\mathbf{V}$ with inhomogeneous terms $\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}$. Furthermore, $\dot{\Phi}$ is a solution to the EOV_κ^c equation (5.0.11) with $\dot{\Phi}(t = 0) = 0$, and the inhomogeneous term l on the right-hand side of (5.0.11) is

$$l \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\kappa^2 - \Delta)\mathring{\dot{\Phi}}_c + 4\pi G(R_c - 3c^{-2}P). \tag{10.2.10}$$

We will return to these facts in Section 10.3, where we will use them in the proofs of some technical lemmas.

As an intermediate step in our proof of (10.2.1a) - (10.2.1f), we will prove the following weaker version of (10.2.1d):

$$c^{-1} \,|||\, \partial_t\Phi \,|||_{H^N,T} \lesssim L_2'. \tag{10.2.1d'}$$

We now define the constants Λ_1, Λ_2, L_2', and L_4. We will then use a variety of energy estimates to define L_1, L_2, and L_3 in terms of these four constants and to show that (10.2.1a) - (10.2.1f) are satisfied if T is small enough. First, to motivate our definitions of L_2', L_4, and Λ_2, see inequalities (A.4) and (A.6) of Lemma A-2 and inequality (A.20) of Corollary A-3, and let $C_0(\kappa)$ denote the constant that appears throughout the lemma and its corollary. By a non-optimal application of Lemma 10-6, we have that

$$C_0(\kappa)\big(c^{-1}\|\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N} + \|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}}\big) \lesssim 1/2 \tag{10.2.11}$$

$$C_0(\kappa)\big(c\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + \|(\Delta - \kappa^2)\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\|_{H^{N-2}}\big) \lesssim 1. \tag{10.2.12}$$

Note also the trivial (and not optimal) estimate $(C_0(\kappa))^2c^{-2}\|\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N}^2 \lesssim 1/4 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\Lambda_2)^2/4$. With these considerations in mind, we define

$$\Lambda_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} 1 \tag{10.2.13}$$

$$L_2' \overset{\text{def}}{=} 1 \tag{10.2.14}$$

$$L_4 \overset{\text{def}}{=} 1. \tag{10.2.15}$$

To define Λ_1, we first define $Z = Z(id;\Lambda_2)$ to be the constant appearing in (10.3.5). Using this value of Z, which we emphasize depends only on Λ_2 and the initial data $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty$ for the EP_κ system, we then define Λ_1 so that (9.0.6) and (9.0.7) hold. Note that it is exactly at this step in the proof that the smoothing ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\dot{\mathbf{W}}}_c$, which is defined in (9.0.5), of the initial data $\mathring{\dot{\mathbf{W}}}_c$, which are the first 5 components of (8.1.9), is fixed.

We find it illuminating display the dependence of other constants that will appear below on $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2', L_4$. Therefore, we continue to refer to (10.2.13) - (10.2.15) by the symbols Λ_2, L_2', and L_4 respectively, even though they are equal to 1.

We now carry out the continuous induction in detail. Let T_c^{max} be the maximal time for which the solution $\mathbf{V}_c$ exists and satisfies the estimates (10.2.1a), (10.2.1b), (10.2.1d'), and (10.2.1f); i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} T_c^{max} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sup\Big\{T|\mathbf{V} \in C^0([0,T], H^N_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1([0,T], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^2([0,T], H^{N-2}_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}_c}(\mathbb{R}^3)),& \\ \text{and } (10.2.1\text{a}), (10.2.1\text{b}),\ (10.2.1\text{d'}), \text{and } (10.2.1\text{f}) \text{ hold}\Big\}.& \end{aligned} \tag{10.2.16}$$

Note that the set we are taking the sup of necessarily contains positive values of T since for all large c, the relevant bounds are satisfied at $T = 0$, and therefore by Theorem 1, also for short times.

---

[28] Recall the convention stated in Remark 5.2.

Lemmas 10-14, 10-4, 10-7, 10-11, 10-9, and inequalities (10.3.30) and (10.3.29) of Lemma 10-10 supply the following estimates which are valid for $0 \leq \tau < T_c^{max}$:

$$\||| \dot{\mathbf{W}} |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim \big[\Lambda_1/2 + \tau \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')\big] \cdot \exp\big(\tau \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')\big) \tag{10.2.17}$$

$$||| \partial_t \mathbf{W} |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim L_1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2') \tag{10.2.18}$$

$$||| \partial_t^2 \eta |||_{H^{N-2},\tau}, ||| \partial_t^2 p |||_{H^{N-2},\tau} \lesssim L_3(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_4) \tag{10.2.19}$$

$$||| \dot{\Phi} |||^2_{H^{N+1},\tau} \lesssim \frac{(\Lambda_2)^2}{4} + C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2) + \tau^2 \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_3, L_4) \tag{10.2.20}$$

$$c^{-1} ||| \partial_t \Phi |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim L_2'/2 + \tau \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2') \tag{10.2.21}$$

$$c^{-1} ||| \partial_t^2 \Phi |||_{H^{N-1},\tau} \lesssim L_4/2 + \tau \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_3, L_4) \tag{10.2.22}$$

$$||| \partial_t \Phi |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim L_2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')/2 + \tau \cdot C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_3, L_4). \tag{10.2.23}$$

We apply the following sequence of reasoning to interpret the above inequalities: first L_1 in (10.2.18) is determined through the known constants Λ_1, Λ_2, and L_2'. Then L_3 in (10.2.19) is determined through the known constants $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2'$, and L_4. Then L_2 in (10.2.23) is determined through $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1$, and L_2'. Finally, the remaining constants $C(\cdots)$ in (10.2.17) - (10.2.22) are all determined through $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_3, L_4$.

By Sobolev embedding and (8.1.13), there exists a cube $[-a, a]^5$ (depending on the initial data, Λ_1, and L_2) such that for all large c, $|| \dot{\Phi} ||_{H^N} \leq \Lambda_1, || \partial_t \Phi ||_{H^N} \leq L_2 \implies$

$$\Big(\dot{\Phi}, \partial_1 \dot{\Phi}, \partial_2 \dot{\Phi}, \partial_3 \dot{\Phi}, \partial_t \Phi\Big)([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset [-a, a]^5, \tag{10.2.24}$$

independent of whether or not $\dot{\Phi}$ or $\partial_t \Phi$ are solutions to an equation. Motivated by these considerations, we define both for use now and use later in the article the following compact sets:

$$K \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathscr{O}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5 \tag{10.2.25}$$

$$\mathfrak{K} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathfrak{O}}_2 \times [-a, a]^5. \tag{10.2.26}$$

Here, $\mathscr{O}_2$ and $\mathfrak{O}_2$ are the sets defined in Section 8.2.

We now choose T so that when $0 \leq \tau \leq T$, it algebraically follows that the right-hand sides of (10.2.17) and (10.2.20) - (10.2.23) are *strictly* less than $\Lambda_1, (\Lambda_2)^2, L_2', L_4$, and L_2 respectively. Note that T may be chosen independently of (all large) c. We now show that $T_c^{max} < T$ is impossible.

Assume that $T_c^{max} < T$. Then observe that the right-hand sides of (10.2.17) and (10.2.20) - (10.2.23) are *strictly* less than $\Lambda_1, (\Lambda_2)^2, L_2', L_4$, and L_2 respectively when $\tau = T_c^{max}$. Therefore, by the construction of the set K described above, by (9.0.6), and by Sobolev embedding, we conclude that for all large c, $\mathbf{V}_c([0, T_c^{max}) \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ is contained in the *interior* of K. Consequently, we may apply Proposition 10-2 to extend the solution in time beyond T_c^{max}, thus contradicting the definition of T_c^{max}. Note that this argument also shows that $\mathbf{V}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset K$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. $\square$

10.3. **The Technical Lemmas.**

We now state and prove the technical lemmas quoted in the proof of Theorem 2. We will require some auxiliary lemmas along the way. Throughout this section, we assume the hypotheses and notation used in our proof of Theorem 2; i.e., $\mathbf{V}$ denotes the solution, $\mathbf{W}$ denotes its first 5 components, the relationship between $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ is given by (5.0.12) and (5.0.14), $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\dot{\Phi}$ are defined in (10.2.2) and (10.2.3) respectively, l is defined in (10.2.10), and so forth. In this section, we typically suppress the dependence of the running constants $C(\cdots)$ on $N, \kappa, \bar{\mathscr{O}}_2, \bar{\mathfrak{O}}_2, K$, and $\mathfrak{K}$.

10.3.1. *The induction hypotheses.* We assume that $\tau \in [0, T_c^{max})$. By the definition (10.2.16) of T_c^{max}, we have the following bounds (10.3.2) - (10.3.4) (we will comment on the bound (10.3.1) in a moment), where Λ_1, L_2', and L_4 are defined in (10.2.13) - (10.2.15) respectively:

$$||| \mathbf{W} - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim \Lambda_1 \tag{10.3.1}$$

$$||| \Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c |||_{H^{N+1},\tau} \lesssim \Lambda_2 \tag{10.3.2}$$

$$c^{-1} ||| \partial_t \Phi |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim L_2' \tag{10.3.3}$$

$$c^{-1} ||| \partial_t^2 \Phi |||_{H^{N-2},\tau} \lesssim L_4. \tag{10.3.4}$$

We note the following easy consequence of (8.1.14) and (10.3.2):

$$(10.3.2') \qquad |||\, \Phi - \bar{\Phi}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \leq |||\, \Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} + |||\, \mathring{\Phi}_c - \bar{\Phi}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim \Lambda_2 + C(id) \overset{\text{def}}{=} C(id;\Lambda_2).$$

It then follows from (8.1.13), (8.1.14), (10.3.2'), and Sobolev embedding that

$$(10.3.5) \qquad |||\, \Phi \,|||_{L^\infty,\tau} \lesssim Z(id;\Lambda_2).$$

Using the value of Z in (10.3.5), which depends only on the data $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty$ for the EP$_\kappa$ system and the known constant Λ_2, we are able to choose a constant $\Lambda_1 > 0$ such that (9.0.6) and (9.0.7) hold. As discussed in sections 9 and 10.2.2, such a choice of Λ_1 also involves fixing the smoothing ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ of $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty$, which then defines ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c$ via equation (9.0.5). We emphasize that it is this choice of ${}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c$ and Λ_1 that appear implicitly in (10.2.17), in (10.2.1a), and in (10.3.1).

Then by (9.0.7) and (10.3.1), we have that

(10.3.1')

$$\begin{aligned} |||\, \mathbf{W} - \bar{\mathbf{W}}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} &\leq |||\, \mathbf{W} - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \; + \; |||\, {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c - \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \; + \; |||\, \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c - \bar{\mathbf{W}}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \\ &\lesssim \; \Lambda_1 + C(id;\Lambda_1) \; + \; C(id) \; \overset{\text{def}}{=} \; C(id;\Lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 6-1, (6.3.9), and (10.3.1'), we have that

$$(10.3.6) \qquad |||\, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_c \,|||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2).$$

Note also that (9.0.6), (10.3.1), and the definition of $\mathfrak{O}_2$ given in Section 8.2 together imply that for all large c, we have that $\mathbf{W}([0,T_c^{max}) \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}([0,T_c^{max}) \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \bar{\mathfrak{O}}_2$.

In our discussion below, we will refer to (10.3.1) - (10.3.6) (10.3.1'), and (10.3.2') as the *induction hypotheses*. Sobolev embedding and the induction hypotheses, which for all large c are satisfied at $\tau = 0$, together imply that $\mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi, c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi, c^{-1}\partial_t^2\Phi$ are each contained in a compact, convex set (depending only on the initial data, $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2'$, and L_4) on $[0,T_c^{max}) \times \mathbb{R}^3$. As stated in Remark 6.5, we will make use of this fact without explicitly mentioning it every time.

10.3.2. *Proofs of the technical lemmas.*

Lemma 10-3. *Consider the quantity l defined in* (10.2.10)*. Then for $m = 0,1,2$, we have*

$$(10.3.7) \qquad (4\pi G)^{-1} l = \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p}) + \mathfrak{F}_c,$$

$$(10.3.8) \qquad (4\pi G)^{-1} \partial_t l = \partial_t\big(\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p)\big) + \mathfrak{G}_c$$

$$(10.3.9) \qquad (4\pi G)^{-1} \partial_t^2 l = \partial_t^2\big(\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p)\big) + \mathfrak{H}_c,$$

where

$$(10.3.10) \qquad \mathfrak{F}_c \in \mathcal{I}^N(c^{m-2};\eta,p,c^{-m}\Phi)$$

$$(10.3.11) \qquad \mathfrak{G}_c \in \mathcal{I}^{N-1}(c^{m-2};\eta,p,c^{-m}\Phi,\partial_t\eta,\partial_t p,c^{-m}\partial_t\Phi)$$

$$(10.3.12) \qquad \mathfrak{H}_c \in \mathcal{I}^{N-2}(c^{m-2};\eta,p,c^{-m}\Phi,\partial_t\eta,\partial_t p,c^{-m}\partial_t\Phi,\partial_t^2\eta,\partial_t^2 p,c^{-m}\partial_t^2\Phi).$$

Proof. It follows from the discussion in Section 8 that

(10.3.13)

$$(4\pi G)^{-1} l = \big(e^{4\Phi/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\eta,p) - e^{4\bar{\Phi}_c/c^2}\mathfrak{R}_c(\bar{\eta},\bar{p})\big) + 3c^{-2}\big(e^{4\bar{\Phi}_c/c^2}\bar{p} - e^{4\Phi/c^2}p\big) + \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta},\bar{p}) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p}).$$

Therefore, (10.3.7) + (10.3.10) follows from Lemma 6-1, Lemma 6-2, and Lemma 6-5. (10.3.8) + (10.3.11) and (10.3.9) + (10.3.12) then follow from Lemma 6-3. □

Lemma 10-4.

$$(10.3.14) \qquad |||\, \partial_t\mathbf{W} \,|||_{H^{N-1},\tau}, \; |||\, \partial_t\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \,|||_{H^{N-1},\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2') \overset{def}{=} L_1(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2').$$

Proof. By using the EN$_\kappa^c$ equations (4.1.1) - (4.1.3) to solve for $\partial_t\mathbf{W}$ and applying Lemma 6-2, (6.3.10) in the cases $\nu = 1,2,3$, Lemma 6-6, Lemma 6-7, and Lemma 6-8, we have that

(10.3.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t\mathbf{W} &= \big({}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\big)^{-1}\big[-{}_c\mathcal{A}^k(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\partial_k\mathbf{W} + \mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi,D\Phi)\big] \\ &= \big({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\big)^{-1}\big[-{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^k(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\partial_k\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} + \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\nabla^{(1)}\Phi)\big] + \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2};\mathbf{W},\nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W},\Phi,\nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \\ &\quad + \; \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-1};\mathbf{W},\nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W},c^{-1}\Phi,c^{-1}D\Phi) \cap \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2};\mathbf{W},\nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W},\Phi,D\Phi). \end{aligned}$$

The bound for $|||\ \partial_t \mathbf{W}\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau}$ now follows from Lemma 6-2, (6.3.13), (6.3.17), the induction hypotheses, (10.3.15), and the definition of $\mathcal{O}^{N-1}(\cdots)$. The bound for $|||\ \partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau}$ then follows from the bound for $|||\ \partial_t \mathbf{W}\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau}$, (6.3.10) in the case $\nu = t, m = 1$, and the induction hypotheses. We remark that we have written the "intersection term" on the right-hand side of (10.3.15) in a form that will be useful in our proofs of Lemma 10-6, and Lemma 10-7; the "c^{-2}" decay is used in Lemma 10-6, while the "dependence on $c^{-1}D\Phi$" is used in Lemma 10-7. Similar comments apply to Corollary 10-5 and equation (10.3.18) below. $\square$

The following indispensable corollary shows that for large c, the EN_{κ}^{c} system can be written as a small perturbation of the EP_{κ} system.

Corollary 10-5. ($\mathbf{EN}_{\kappa}^{c} \approx \mathbf{EP}_{\kappa}$ for Large c)

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \big({}_{\infty}\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\big)^{-1}\big[-{}_{\infty}\mathcal{A}^k(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\partial_k \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} + \mathfrak{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi)\big] \ &+\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \\ +\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-1}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, c^{-1}\Phi, c^{-1}D\Phi) &\cap \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, D\Phi).\end{aligned} \tag{10.3.16}$$

Proof. Recall that $\partial_t \mathbf{W}$ and $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ differ only in that the second component of $\partial_t \mathbf{W}$ is $\partial_t P$, while the second component of $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is $\partial_t p$. Therefore, it follows trivially from (10.3.15) that (10.3.16) holds for all the components of $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ except for the second component $\partial_t p$.

To handle the component $\partial_t p$, we first observe that the second component of the array $-\big({}_{\infty}\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\big)^{-1}\big[-{}_{\infty}\mathcal{A}^k(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\partial_k \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} + \mathfrak{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi)\big]$ is equal to $-v^k\partial_k p - \mathfrak{Q}_{\infty}(\eta, p)\partial_k v^k$. It thus follows directly from considering the second component of (10.3.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t P = -v^k\partial_k p - \mathfrak{Q}_{\infty}(\eta, p)\partial_k v^k \ &+\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \\ +\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-1}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, c^{-1}\Phi, c^{-1}D\Phi) &\cap \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, D\Phi).\end{aligned} \tag{10.3.17}$$

Therefore, since $\partial_t p - \partial_t P = (e^{-4\Phi/c^2} - 1)\partial_t P - 4(c^{-2}\partial_t\Phi)e^{-4\Phi/c^2}P$, we use Lemma 6-2, (6.3.5), (6.3.10), (6.3.11), Lemma 6-6, and (10.3.17) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t p = -v^k\partial_k p - \mathfrak{Q}_{\infty}(\eta, p)\partial_k v^k \ &+\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) \\ +\ \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-1}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, c^{-1}\Phi, c^{-1}D\Phi) &\cap \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; \mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\mathbf{W}, \Phi, D\Phi).\end{aligned} \tag{10.3.18}$$

$\square$

Lemma 10-6. *There exists a constant $C(id) > 0$ such that*

$$\|l(0)\|_{H^N} \lesssim c^{-2}C(id) \tag{10.3.19}$$

$$\|(\Delta - \kappa^2)\mathring{\Psi}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim c^{-2}C(id). \tag{10.3.20}$$

Proof. The estimate (10.3.19) follows from the estimate (10.3.7) for $l(t)$ at $t = 0$ and (10.3.10) in the case $m = 0$.

To obtain the estimate (10.3.20), first recall that according to the assumption (8.1.7) and the chain rule, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(4\pi G)^{-1}(\kappa^2 - \Delta)\mathring{\Psi}_0 &= \partial_k\big(\mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\big) \\ &= \frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}}{\partial \eta}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\partial_k\mathring{\eta} + \frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}}{\partial p}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\partial_k\mathring{p} + \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\partial_k\mathring{v}^k.\end{aligned} \tag{10.3.21}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 6-2, (10.3.8) at $t = 0$, (10.3.11) in the case $m = 0$, the chain rule, (4.1.1), definition (4.2.6), (10.3.18), and (3.1.16) in the case $c = \infty$, we have that

$$(4\pi G)^{-1}\partial_t l(0) = -\frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}}{\partial \eta}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\partial_k\mathring{\eta} - \frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}}{\partial p}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\mathring{v}^k\partial_k\mathring{p} - \mathfrak{R}_{\infty}(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})\partial_k\mathring{v}^k + \mathcal{O}^{N-1}(c^{-2}; id). \tag{10.3.22}$$

The estimate (10.3.20) now follows from (10.3.21) and (10.3.22).

$\square$

Lemma 10-7.

$$|||\ \partial_t^2\eta\ |||_{H^{N-2},\tau},\ |||\ \partial_t^2 p\ |||_{H^{N-2},\tau} \lesssim C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_4) \overset{def}{=} L_3(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2', L_4). \tag{10.3.23}$$

Proof. To obtain the bound for $\partial_t^2 p$, differentiate each side of the expression (10.3.18) with respect to t, and then apply Lemma 6-3 to conclude that

$$\partial_t^2 p = -\partial_t\big[v^k\partial_k p + \mathfrak{Q}_\infty(\eta,p)\partial_k v^k\big] + \mathfrak{G}_c, \tag{10.3.24}$$

where $\mathfrak{G}_c \in \mathcal{I}^{N-2}(c^{-1};\mathbf{W}, D\mathbf{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\partial_t\mathbf{W}, \Phi, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi, c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi, c^{-1}\nabla^{(1)}\partial_t\Phi, c^{-1}\partial_t^2\Phi)$. We now use Lemma 6-2, the induction hypotheses, the previously established bounds (10.3.14) on $|||\ \partial_t\mathbf{W}\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau}$ and $|||\ \partial_t\mathcal{W}\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau}$, and the definition of $\mathcal{I}^{N-2}(\cdots)$ to conclude the estimate (10.3.23) for $|||\ \partial_t^2 p\ |||_{H^{N-2},\tau}$.

The estimate for $\partial_t^2\eta$ is similar, and in fact much simpler: use equation (4.1.1) to solve for $\partial_t\eta$, and then differentiate with respect to t and reason as above. □

Lemma 10-8.

$$|||\ l\ |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2) \tag{10.3.25}$$

$$|||\ \partial_t l\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2') \tag{10.3.26}$$

$$|||\ \partial_t^2 l\ |||_{H^{N-2},\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4). \tag{10.3.27}$$

Proof. To prove (10.3.25), we first consider the formula for l given in (10.3.7) + (10.3.10). By Lemma 6-1 and (10.3.6), we have that $|||\ \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p})\ |||_{H^N,\tau} \leq |||\ \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta,p) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta},\bar{p})\ |||_{H^N,\tau} + |||\ \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\bar{\eta},\bar{p}) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta},\mathring{p})\ |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$. To estimate $|||\ \mathfrak{F}_c\ |||_{H^N,\tau}$, where $\mathfrak{F}_c$ is from (10.3.7), simply use (10.3.10) in the case $m = 0$ together with (10.3.2') and (10.3.6). The proofs of (10.3.26) and (10.3.27) follow similarly from the expressions (10.3.8), (10.3.9), (10.3.11) in the case $m = 1$, and (10.3.12) in the case $m = 1$, together with Lemma 6-2 and the bounds supplied by the induction hypotheses, Lemma 10-4, and Lemma 10-7. □

Lemma 10-9.

$$c^{-1}\ |||\ \partial_t\Phi\ |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim 1/2 + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2') \overset{def}{=} L_2'/2 + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2'). \tag{10.3.28}$$

Proof. (10.3.28) follows from definition (10.2.14), Lemma 10-6, inequality (10.3.26) of Lemma 10-8, and inequality (A.4) of Lemma A-2. □

Lemma 10-10.

$$\begin{aligned} |||\ \partial_t\Phi\ |||_{H^N,\tau} &\lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2') + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4) \\ &\overset{def}{=} L_2(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2')/2 + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4) \end{aligned} \tag{10.3.29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c^{-1}\ |||\ \partial_t^2\Phi\ |||_{H^{N-1},\tau} &\lesssim 1/2 + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4) \\ &\overset{def}{=} L_4/2 + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4). \end{aligned} \tag{10.3.30}$$

Proof. The estimate (10.3.29) follows from Lemma 10-6, inequalities (10.3.26) and (10.3.27) of Lemma 10-8, and inequality (A.25) of Proposition A-5. The estimate (10.3.30) follows from definition (10.2.15), Lemma 10-6, inequality (10.3.27) of Lemma 10-8, and inequality (A.6) of Lemma A-2. □

Remark 10.7. Interestingly, (10.3.29) provides a bound for $|||\ \partial_t\Phi\ |||_{H^N,\tau}$ that depends in part on the bound $|||\ c^{-1}\partial_t\Phi\ |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim L_2'$.

Lemma 10-11.

$$|||\ \dot{\Phi}\ |||^2_{H^{N+1},\tau} \lesssim \frac{(\Lambda_2)^2}{4} + \tau\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2) + \tau^2\cdot C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2',L_3,L_4). \tag{10.3.31}$$

Proof. Inequality (10.3.31) follows from definition (10.2.13), (10.3.25), (10.3.29), and inequality (A.20) of Corollary A-3. □

Lemma 10-12. *Let* ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ *be the energy current* (7.1.1) *for the variation* $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ *defined by the BGS* $\mathbf{V}$, *and let* $\mathbf{b} \overset{def}{=} (f, g, \cdots, h^{(3)})$, *where* $f, g, \cdots, h^{(3)}$ *are the inhomogeneous terms from the* EOV_κ^c *satisfied by* $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ *that are defined in* (10.2.4) - (10.2.6) *and that also appear in the expression* (7.3.1) *for the divergence of* ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$. *Then on* $[0, T_c^{max})$,

$$\|\partial_\mu\big({}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^\mu\big)\|_{L^1} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_1,L_2')\cdot\big[\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|^2_{L^2} + \|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^2}\big]. \tag{10.3.32}$$

Proof. We separate the terms on the right-hand side of (7.3.1) into two types: those that depend quadratically on the variations, and those that depend linearly on the variations. We first bound (for all large c) the L^1 norm of the terms that depend quadratically on the variations by $C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2') \cdot \|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{L^2}^2$. This follows directly from the fact that the coefficients of the quadratic variation terms can be bounded in L^∞ by $C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')$. Such an L^∞ bound may be obtained by combining Remark 6.7, Lemma 6-5 in the case $m = 1$, Remark 6.10, the induction hypotheses, (10.3.14), and Sobolev embedding.

We similarly bound the L^1 norm of the terms that depend linearly on the variations by $C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \cdot \|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^2}$, but for these terms, we also make use of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for integrals. ☐

We also state here the following corollary that will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.

Corollary 10-13. *Let* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \in C^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([0,T], H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c}) \cap C^1([0,T_c], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c})$, *and assume that* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathfrak{K}$, *where* $\mathfrak{K}$ *is defined in* (10.2.26). *Let* $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ *be a solution to the* EOV^∞_κ (5.0.8) - (5.0.10) *defined by the BGS* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *with inhomogeneous terms* $\mathbf{b} = (f, g, \cdots, h^{(3)})$, *where* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *denotes the first 5 components of* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. *Let* ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ *be the energy current* (7.1.2) *for the variation* $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ *defined by the BGS* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. *Then on* $[0,T]$,

$$\|\partial_\mu\big({}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^\mu\big)\|_{L^1} \leq C(\mathfrak{K}; |||\, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\, |||_{L^\infty,T}, |||\, \partial_t \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\, |||_{L^\infty,T}) \cdot \big[\|\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{b}\|_{L^2}\big]. \tag{10.3.33}$$

Proof. We do not give any details since Corollay 10-13 can proved by arguing as we did in our proof of Lemma 10-12. In fact, the proof of Corollay 10-13 is simpler: c does not enter into the estimates. ☐

Lemma 10-14.

$$|||\, \dot{\mathbf{W}}\, |||_{H^N,\tau} \lesssim \big[\Lambda_1/2 + \tau \cdot C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')\big] \cdot \exp\big(\tau \cdot C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')\big). \tag{10.3.34}$$

Proof. Our proof of Lemma 10-14 follows from a Gronwall estimate in the H^N norm of the variation $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ defined in (10.2.2). Rather than directly estimating the H^N norm of $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$, we instead estimate the L^1 norm of ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}^0_{\vec{\alpha}}$, where ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ is the energy current for the variation $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ defined by the BGS $\mathbf{V}$. This is favorable because of property (7.2.1) and because by (7.3.1), the divergence of ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ is lower order in $\dot{\mathbf{W}}$. We follow the method of proof of local existence from [18]; the only difficulty is checking that our estimates are independent of all large c. An important ingredient in our proof is showing that for $0 \leq |\vec{\alpha}| \leq N$ and $t \in [0, T_c^{max})$, we have the bound

$$\|\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2')\big(1 + \|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}\big), \tag{10.3.35}$$

where $\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ is defined in (10.2.8). Let us assume (10.3.35) for the moment; we will provide a proof at the end of the proof of the lemma.

We now let ${}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ denote the energy current (7.1.1) for the variation $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ defined by the BGS $\mathbf{V}$, and abbreviating $\dot{\mathfrak{J}}_{\vec{\alpha}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}^{(c)}\dot{\mathfrak{J}}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ to ease the notation, we define $\mathcal{E}(t) \geq 0$ by

$$\mathcal{E}^2(t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \dot{\mathfrak{J}}^0_{\vec{\alpha}}(t, \mathbf{s})\, d^3\mathbf{s}. \tag{10.3.36}$$

By (8.3.1), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for sums, we have that

$$C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2(t) \lesssim C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}^{-1}\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}^2. \tag{10.3.37}$$

Here, the value of $Z = Z(id; \Lambda_2)$ is given by (10.3.5).

Then by Lemma 10-12, (10.3.35), (10.3.37), with $C \overset{\text{def}}{=} C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{E}\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E} = \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\mu \dot{\mathfrak{J}}^\mu_{\vec{\alpha}}\, d^3\mathbf{s} &\lesssim C \cdot \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq N} \big(\|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}\|_{L^2}\big) \\ &\lesssim C \cdot \big(\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}^2 + \|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}\big) \lesssim C \cdot \big(\mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{10.3.38}$$

We now apply Gronwall's inequality to (10.3.38), concluding that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim \big[\mathcal{E}(0) + Ct\big] \cdot \exp(Ct). \tag{10.3.39}$$

Using (10.3.37) again, it follows from (10.3.39) that

$$\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}(t)\|_{H^N} \lesssim \big(C^{-1}_{\bar{\mathfrak{O}}_2,Z}\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}(0)\|_{H^N_{\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c}} + Ct\big) \cdot \exp(Ct). \tag{10.3.40}$$

Recalling that $\dot{\mathbf{W}}(0) = \mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c - {}^{(0)}\mathring{\mathbf{W}}_c$ and taking into account inequality (9.0.7), the estimate (10.3.34) now follows.

It remains to show (10.3.35). Our proof is based on the Sobolev-Moser lemmas stated in Appendix B and the $c-$independent estimates of Section 6. With the 5 components of the array $\mathbf{b}$ defined by (10.2.4) - (10.2.6), we first claim that the term ${}_c\mathcal{A}^0\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\big(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}\big)$ from (10.2.8) satisfies

$$\|{}_c\mathcal{A}^0\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\big(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}\big)\|_{L^2} \leq C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2'), \tag{10.3.41}$$

where, as is true throughout this section, all of the estimates we derive are valid on $[0,T_c^{max})$. Because (6.3.14) and the induction hypotheses together imply that $\|{}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$, it suffices to control the H^N norm of $({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}$. Then by the induction hypotheses, (6.3.14), Proposition B-2, and Remark B.1, with $({}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi))^{-1}$ playing the role of F in the proposition and $\mathbf{b}$ playing the role of G, we have that

$$\|({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}\|_{H^N} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)\|\mathbf{b}\|_{H^N}. \tag{10.3.42}$$

To estimate $\|\mathbf{b}\|_{H^N}$, we first split the array $\mathbf{b}$ into two arrays:

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi,D\Phi) + \mathfrak{I}_c(id,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi), \tag{10.3.43}$$

where $\mathfrak{B}_c$ is defined in Lemma 6-8 and the 5-component array $\mathfrak{I}_c$ comprises the terms from (10.2.4) - (10.2.6) containing at least one factor of the smoothed initial data. By Lemma 6-2, Lemma 6-5, and Remark 6.10, we have that

$$\mathfrak{I}_c \in \mathcal{I}^N(id,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi), \tag{10.3.44}$$

and from (10.3.44) and the induction hypotheses, it follows that

$$\|\mathfrak{I}_c(id,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\|_{H^N} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2). \tag{10.3.45}$$

Furthermore, by (6.3.18) in the case $m=1$ and the induction hypotheses, we have that

$$\|\mathfrak{B}_c(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi,D\Phi)\|_{H^N} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2'). \tag{10.3.46}$$

Combining (10.3.43), (10.3.45) and (10.3.46), we have that

$$\|\mathbf{b}\|_{H^N} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2,L_2'). \tag{10.3.47}$$

Now (10.3.42) and (10.3.47) together imply (10.3.41).

We next claim that the $\mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ terms (10.2.9) satisfy

$$\|\mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)\|\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^N}. \tag{10.3.48}$$

Since $\|{}_c\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)$, to prove (10.3.48), it suffices to control the L^2 norm of $({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k(\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathbf{W}}) - \partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\left(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k\dot{\mathbf{W}}\right)$. By the induction hypotheses, (6.3.14), Proposition B-5, and Remark B.3, with $({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k = \left(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\right)(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}},\Phi)$ playing the role of F in the proposition, and $\partial_k\dot{\mathbf{W}}$ playing the role of G, we have (for $0 \leq |\vec{\alpha}| \leq N$) that

$$\|({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}(\partial_k\dot{\mathbf{W}}) - \partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\big(({}_c\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_c\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k\dot{\mathbf{W}}\big)\|_{L^2} \lesssim C(id;\Lambda_1,\Lambda_2)\|\nabla^{(1)}\dot{\mathbf{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}}, \tag{10.3.49}$$

from which (10.3.48) readily follows. This concludes the proof of (10.3.35), and therefore also the proof of Lemma 10-14. □

11. THE NON-RELATIVISTIC LIMIT OF THE EN^c_κ SYSTEM

In this section, we state and prove our main theorem regarding the non-relativistic limit of the EN^c_κ system. Before stating our main theorem, we first state and prove a corollary of Theorem 2 that will be used in the proof of Theorem 4, and we also briefly discuss local existence for the EP_κ system.

11.1. **$\mathbf{EN}_\kappa^c$ well-approximates $\mathbf{EP}_\kappa$ for large c.** The following corollary shows that for large c, solutions to the EN_κ^c system are "almost" solutions to the EP_κ system.

Corollary 11-1. *For all large c, the solutions $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = (\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \Phi, D\Phi)$ to the EN_κ^c system* (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) *furnished by Theorem 2 satisfy*

$$ {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})\partial_\mu\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) + \mathfrak{E}1_c \tag{11.1.1}$$

$$ \Delta(\Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c) - \kappa^2(\Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c) = 4\pi G[\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\mathring{\eta}, \mathring{p})] + \mathfrak{E}2_c, \tag{11.1.2}$$

where

$$ |||\ \mathfrak{E}1_c\ |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim c^{-2}C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_2) \tag{11.1.3}$$

$$ |||\ \mathfrak{E}2_c\ |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim c^{-1}C(id; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_4), \tag{11.1.4}$$

and T is from Theorem 2.

Remark 11.1. Note that the left-hand side of (11.1.1) involves $\partial_\mu\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ *rather than* $\partial_\mu\mathbf{W}$.

Proof. The estimate (11.1.3) follows from multiplying each side of (10.3.16) by ${}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}})$, and then combining Proposition B-2, Remark B.1, (10.2.1d), and the induction hypotheses from Section 10.3.1, which are valid on $[0, T]$. Similarly, the estimate (11.1.4) follows from the fact that $\Delta(\Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c) - \kappa^2(\Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c) = c^{-2}\partial_t^2\Phi + l$, where l is given by (10.3.13), together with (10.3.7), (10.3.10) in the case $m = 0$, (10.2.1f), and the induction hypotheses. $\square$

11.2. **Local Existence for $\mathbf{EP}_\kappa$.**

In this section, we briefly discuss local existence for the EP_κ system.

Theorem 3. (Local Existence for $\mathbf{EP}_\kappa$) *Let $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ denote the initial data* (8.1.1) *for the EP_κ system* (4.2.1) - (4.2.6) *that are subject to the conditions described in Section 8. Assume further that the equation of state is "physical" as described in sections 3.1 and 6.3. Then there exists a $T > 0$ such that* (4.2.1) - (4.2.6) *has a unique classical solution $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty(t, \mathbf{s})$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ of the form $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty = (\eta_\infty, p_\infty, \cdots, \partial_3\Phi_\infty)$ with $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty(0, \mathbf{s}) = \mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty(\mathbf{s})$. The solution satisfies $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathfrak{K}$, where the compact set $\mathfrak{K}$ is defined in* (10.2.26)*. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty \in C^0([0, T], H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty}) \cap C^1([0, T], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty})$ and $\Phi \in C^0([0, T], H^{N+1}_{\bar{\Phi}_\infty}) \cap C^1([0, T], H^N_{\bar{\Phi}_\infty}) \cap C^2([0, T], H^{N-1}_{\bar{\Phi}_\infty})$.*

Proof. Theorem 3 can be proved by an iteration scheme based on the method of energy currents: energy currents ${}_{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}$ can be used to control $\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty(t)\|_{H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}}}$, while $\|\Phi_\infty(t)\|_{H^{N+1}_{\bar{\Phi}_\infty}}$ can be controlled using an easy estimate on the operator $\Delta - \kappa^2$. These methods are employed in the proof of Theorem 4 below, so we don't provide a proof here. Similar techniques are used by Makino in [12]. We remark that these methods apply in particular to the system studied by Kiessling (as described in Section 4.2) in [10]. $\square$

11.3. **Statement and Proof of the Main Theorem.**

Theorem 4. (The Non-relativistic Limit of $\mathbf{EN}_\kappa^c$) *Let $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ denote initial data* (8.1.1) *for the EP_κ system* (4.2.1) - (4.2.6) *that are subject to the conditions described in Section 8. Let $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c$ denote the corresponding initial data* (8.1.8) *for the EN_κ^c system* (4.1.1) - (4.1.8) *constructed from $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ as described in Section 8, and assume that the $c-$indexed equation of state satisfies the hypotheses* (6.3.1) *and* (6.3.2) *and is "physical" as described in sections 3.1 and 6.3. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty \overset{def}{=} (\eta_\infty, p_\infty, v_\infty^1, \cdots, \partial_3\Phi_\infty)$ $\big(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_c \overset{def}{=} (\eta_c, p_c, v_c^1, \cdots, \partial_3\Phi_c)\big)$ denote the solution to the EP_κ $\big(EN_\kappa^c\big)$ system launched by $\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_\infty$ $\big(\mathring{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}}_c\big)$ as furnished by Theorem 3 (Theorem 2). By Theorem 3 and Theorem 2, we may assume that for all large c, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_c$ exist on a common spacetime slab $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$, where T is the minimum of the two times from the conclusions of the theorems. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c$ denote the first 5 components of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_c$ respectively. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$ |||\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c\ |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim c^{-1} \cdot C \tag{11.3.1}$$

$$ |||\ \big(\Phi_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty\big) - \big(\Phi_c - \bar{\Phi}_c\big)\ |||_{H^{N+1},T} \lesssim c^{-1} \cdot C \tag{11.3.2}$$

$$ \lim_{c\to\infty} |\bar{\Phi}_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_c| = 0, \tag{11.3.3}$$

where the constants $\bar{\Phi}_\infty$ *and* $\bar{\Phi}_c$ *are defined through the initial data by* (8.1.3) *and* (8.1.12) *respectively.*

Remark 11.2. (11.3.1), (11.3.2), (11.3.3), and Sobolev embedding imply (recall $N \geq 4$) that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c \to \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$ uniformly and $\Phi_c \to \Phi_\infty$ uniformly on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ as $c \to \infty$. Furthermore, the interpolation estimate (B.36), together with the uniform bound $|||\, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c \,|||_{H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_c},T} \lesssim C$ that follows from combining (6.3.9), (10.2.1a), and (10.2.1b), collectively imply that $\lim_{c\to\infty} |||\, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c \,|||_{H^{N'},T} = 0$ for any $N' < N$. The reason that we cannot use our argument to obtain the H^N norm on the left-hand side of (11.3.1) instead of the H^{N-1} norm is that the expression (11.3.8) for $\mathbf{b}$ already involves one derivative of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$, and therefore can only be controlled in the H^{N-1} norm.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we refer to the constants Λ_1, Λ_2, etc., from the conclusion of Theorem 2, but we typically suppress the dependence of the running constants $C(\cdots)$ on $N, \kappa, \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2, \bar{\mathfrak{D}}_2, K$, and $\mathfrak{K}$. To further ease the notation, we drop the subscripts c from the solution $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_c$ and its first 5 components $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c$, setting $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_c$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_c$, etc. We then define with the aid of (8.1.14)

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \tag{11.3.4}$$

$$\dot{\Phi} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\Phi_\infty - \bar{\Phi}_\infty) - (\Phi - \bar{\Phi}_c) = (\Phi_\infty - \mathring{\Phi}_\infty) - (\Phi - \mathring{\Phi}_c). \tag{11.3.5}$$

Our proof of Theorem 4 is similar to our proof of Lemma 10-14; we use energy currents and elementary harmonic analysis (i.e. Lemma A-4) to obtain a Gronwall estimate for the H^{N-1} norm of the variation $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ defined in (11.3.4). It will also follow from our proof that the H^{N+1} norm of $\dot{\Phi}$ is controlled in terms of $\|\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\|_{H^{N-1}}$ plus a small remainder. We remark that all of the estimates in this proof are valid on the interval $[0,T]$, where T is as in the statement of the theorem.

From definitions (11.3.4) and (11.3.5), it follows that $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}, \dot{\Phi}$ are solutions to the following EOV_κ^∞ defined by the BGS $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$:

$${}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty)\partial_\mu \dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}} = \mathbf{b} \tag{11.3.6}$$

$$(\Delta - \kappa^2)\dot{\Phi} = l, \tag{11.3.7}$$

where

$$\mathbf{b} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi_\infty) - \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi) + \big[{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) - {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty)\big]\partial_\mu \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} - \mathfrak{E}1_c, \tag{11.3.8}$$

$$l \overset{\text{def}}{=} 4\pi G\big[\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta_\infty, p_\infty) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)\big] - \mathfrak{E}2_c, \tag{11.3.9}$$

$\mathfrak{B}_\infty$ is defined in Lemma 6-8, and $\mathfrak{E}1_c$, $\mathfrak{E}2_c$ are defined in Corollary 11-1. Note that the definition of l in (11.3.9) differs from the definition of l (10.3.13) used in the proof of Corollary 11-1. By comparing (8.1.1) and (8.1.8), we see that the initial condition satisfied by $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ is

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}(t = 0) = \mathbf{0}. \tag{11.3.10}$$

Differentiating equation (11.3.6) with $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}$, have that

$${}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty)\partial_\mu\big(\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\big) = \mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}, \tag{11.3.11}$$

where (suppressing the dependence of ${}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\nu(\cdot)$ on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$ for $\nu = 0,1,2,3$)

$$\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\left(({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}\mathbf{b}\right) + \mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}} \tag{11.3.12}$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}_{\vec{\alpha}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0\big[({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^k\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}(\partial_k\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}) - \partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\big(({}_\infty\mathcal{A}^0)^{-1}{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^k\partial_k\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\big)\big]. \tag{11.3.13}$$

As an intermediate step, we will show that for $0 \leq |\vec{\alpha}| \leq N-1$ and $t \in [0,T]$, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}\|_{L^2} \lesssim C\big(id; |||\, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty \,|||_{H^N_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}_\infty},T}, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2, L_4\big) \cdot \big(\|\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^{-1}\big). \tag{11.3.14}$$

Let us assume (11.3.14) for the moment and proceed as in Lemma 10-14: we let ${}^{(\infty)}\dot{\mathscr{J}}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ denote the energy current (7.1.2) for $\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}}$ defined by the BGS $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\infty$, and define $\mathcal{E}(t) \geq 0$ by

$$\mathcal{E}^2(t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}| \leq N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \dot{\mathscr{J}}^0_{\vec{\alpha}}(t, \mathbf{s})\, d^3\mathbf{s}, \tag{11.3.15}$$

where we have dropped the superscript (∞) on $\dot{\mathfrak{J}}$ to ease the notation. By (8.3.1) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for sums, we have that

$$C_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}\|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|^2_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2(t) \lesssim C^{-1}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_2,Z}\|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|^2_{H^{N-1}}. \tag{11.3.16}$$

Here, $Z = ||| \Phi_\infty |||_{L^\infty,T}$. Then by Corollary 10-13 + Sobolev embedding, (11.3.14), and (11.3.16), with $C = C\big(id; ||| \mathcal{W}_\infty |||_{H^N_{\bar{\mathcal{W}}_\infty},T}, ||| \partial_t \mathcal{W}_\infty |||_{H^{N-1},T}, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2, L_4\big)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{E}\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E} &= \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}|\leq N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \partial_\mu \dot{\mathfrak{J}}^\mu_{\vec{\alpha}} \, d^3\mathbf{s} \lesssim C \cdot \sum_{|\vec{\alpha}|\leq N-1} \big(\|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|^2_{L^2} + \|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}\|_{L^2}\big) \\ &\lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|^2_{H^{N-1}} + c^{-1}C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim C \cdot \mathcal{E}^2 + c^{-1}C \cdot \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \tag{11.3.17}$$

Taking into account (11.3.10), which implies that $\mathcal{E}(0) = 0$, we apply Gronwall's inequality to (11.3.17), concluding that for $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \lesssim c^{-1}C \cdot t \cdot \exp(C \cdot t). \tag{11.3.18}$$

From (11.3.16) and (11.3.18), it follows that

$$||| \dot{\mathcal{W}} |||_{H^{N-1},T} \lesssim c^{-1}C \cdot T \cdot \exp(T \cdot C), \tag{11.3.19}$$

which implies (11.3.1).

We now return to the proof of (11.3.14). To prove (11.3.14), we show only that the following bound holds for $t \in [0,T]$, where for the remainder of this section,
$C = C\big(id; ||| \mathcal{W}_\infty |||_{H^{N-1}_{\bar{\mathcal{W}}_\infty},T}, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, L_1, L_2, L_4\big)$:

$$\|\mathbf{b}\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^{-1}C. \tag{11.3.20}$$

The remaining details, which we leave up to the reader, then follow as in the proof of Lemma 10-14. By (10.3.6), which is valid for $\tau = T$, and by (B.32), we have that

$$\|\mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta_\infty, p_\infty) - \mathfrak{R}_\infty(\eta, p)\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}}, \tag{11.3.21}$$

and combining (11.1.4), (11.3.7), (11.3.9), (11.3.21), and Lemma A-4, it follows that

$$\|\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^{N+1}} \lesssim C \cdot \|l\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^{-1}C. \tag{11.3.22}$$

Similarly, taking into account (11.3.22), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{B}_\infty(\mathcal{W}_\infty, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi_\infty) - \mathfrak{B}_\infty(\mathcal{W}, \nabla^{(1)}\Phi)\|_{H^{N-1}} &\lesssim C \cdot (\|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}} + \|\nabla^{(1)}\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^{N-1}}) \\ &\lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^{-1}C. \end{aligned} \tag{11.3.23}$$

Finally, by (10.3.6) and (10.3.14), which are both valid for $\tau = T$, by (B.30), and by (B.32), we have that

$$\big\|\big[{}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\mathcal{W}) - {}_\infty\mathcal{A}^\mu(\mathcal{W}_\infty)\big]\partial_\mu\mathcal{W}\big\|_{H^{N-1}} \lesssim C \cdot \|\dot{\mathcal{W}}\|_{H^{N-1}}. \tag{11.3.24}$$

Inequality (11.3.20) now follows from (11.1.3), (11.3.8), (11.3.23), and (11.3.24). The estimate (11.3.2) then follows from (11.3.5), (11.3.19), and (11.3.22), while (11.3.3) is merely a restatement of (8.1.13). $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Michael Kiessling and A. Shadi Tahvildar-Zadeh for discussing this project with me and for providing comments that were helpful in my revision of the earlier drafts. Work supported by NSF Grant DMS-0406951. Any opinions, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

Appendices

A. Inhomogeneous Linear Klein-Gordon Estimates

In this Appendix, we collect together some standard energy estimates for the linear Klein-Gordon equation with an inhomogeneous term. We provide some proofs for convenience.

Lemma A-1. *Let* $l \in C^0([0,T], H^N(\mathbb{R}^3))$ *and* $\mathring{\Psi}_0(\mathbf{s}) \in H^N(\mathbb{R}^3)$, *where* $N \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then there is a unique solution* $\dot{\Phi}(t,\mathbf{s}) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ *to the equation*

$$-c^{-2}\partial_t^2\dot{\Phi} + \Delta\dot{\Phi} - \kappa^2\dot{\Phi} = l \tag{A.1}$$

with initial data $\dot{\Phi}(0,\mathbf{s}) = 0$, $\partial_t\dot{\Phi}(0,\mathbf{s}) = \mathring{\Psi}_0(\mathbf{s})$. *The solution has the property* $\dot{\Phi} \in C^0([0,T], H^{N+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1([0,T], H^N(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

Proof. This is a standard result; consult [17] for a proof. □

Lemma A-2. *Assume the hypotheses of Lemma A-1. Assume further that* $\partial_t l \in C^0([0,T], H^{N-1}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ *and* $\partial_t^2 l \in C^0([0,T], H^{N-2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. *Then there exists a constant* $C_0(\kappa) > 0$ *such that*

$$|||\,\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^{N+1},T} \leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(c^{-1}\|\mathring{\Psi}_0\|_{H^N} + cT\,|||\,l\,|||_{H^N,T}\,\big) \tag{A.2}$$

$$|||\,\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^N,T} \leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(\|\mathring{\Psi}_0\|_{H^N} + c^2T\,|||\,l\,|||_{H^N,T}\,\big) \tag{A.3}$$

$$|||\,\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^N,T} \leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(\|\mathring{\Psi}_0\|_{H^N} + c\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + cT\,|||\,\partial_t l\,|||_{H^{N-1},T}\,\big) \tag{A.4}$$

$$|||\,\partial_t^2\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^{N-1},T} \leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(c\|\mathring{\Psi}_0\|_{H^N} + c^2\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^2T\,|||\,\partial_t l\,|||_{H^{N-1},T}\,\big) \tag{A.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&|||\,\partial_t^2\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^{N-1},T} \\ &\qquad\leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(c^2\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + c\|(\Delta-\kappa^2)\mathring{\Psi}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\|_{H^{N-2}} + cT\,|||\,\partial_t^2 l\,|||_{H^{N-2},T}\,\big)\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

$$|||\,\partial_t^3\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^{N-2},T} \tag{A.7}$$

$$\leq C_0(\kappa)\cdot\big(c^3\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + c^2\|(\Delta-\kappa^2)\mathring{\Psi}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\|_{H^{N-2}} + c^2T\,|||\,\partial_t^2 l\,|||_{H^{N-2},T}\,\big). \tag{A.8}$$

Proof. Because $\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}$ is a solution to the Klein-Gordon equation $-c^{-2}\partial_t^2\big(\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\big) + \Delta\big(\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\big) - \kappa^2\big(\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\big) = \nabla^{(k)}l$, we will use standard energy estimates for the linear Klein-Gordon equation to estimate $|||\,\dot{\Phi}\,|||_{H^{N+1},T}$. Thus, for $0 \leq k \leq N$, we define $E_k(t) \geq 0$ by

$$E_k^2(t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|\kappa\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^{(k+1)}\dot{\Phi}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|c^{-1}\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{A.9}$$

We now multiply each side the equation satisfied by $\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}$ by $-\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}$, integrate by parts over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and use Hölder's inequality to arrive at the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}E_k(t)\frac{d}{dt}E_k(t) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\big(E_k^2(t)\big) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(-\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\big)\cdot\big(\nabla^{(k)}l\big)\,d\mathbf{s} \\ &\leq \|\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^{(k)}l(t)\|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

where $\big(-\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\big)\cdot\big(\nabla^{(k)}l\big)$ denotes the array-valued quantity formed by taking the component by component product of the two arrays $-\nabla^{(k)}\partial_t\dot{\Phi}$ and $\nabla^{(k)}l$.

If we now define $E(t) \geq 0$ by

$$E^2(t) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N} E_k^2(t)\right) = \kappa^2\|\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{H^N}^2 + \|\nabla^{(1)}\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{H^N}^2 + c^{-2}\|\partial_t\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{H^N}^2, \tag{A.11}$$

it follows from (A.10) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for sums that

$$E(t)\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(E^2(t)) \leq \|\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^N}\|l(t)\|_{H^N} \leq cE(t)\|l(t)\|_{H^N}, \tag{A.12}$$

and so

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) \leq c\|l(t)\|_{H^N}. \tag{A.13}$$

Integrating (A.13) over time, we have the following inequality, valid for $t \in [0,T]$:

$$E(t) \leq E(0) + ct\,|||\,l\,|||_{H^N,T}\,. \tag{A.14}$$

From the definition of $E(t)$ and the initial condition $\dot{\Phi} = 0$, we have that

$$\|\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{H^{N+1}} \leq C(\kappa)E(t) \tag{A.15}$$

$$\|\partial_t\dot{\Phi}(t)\|_{H^N} \leq cE(t) \tag{A.16}$$

$$E(0) = c^{-1}\|\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N}. \tag{A.17}$$

Combining (A.14), (A.15), (A.16), and (A.17), and taking the sup over $t \in [0,T]$ proves (A.2) and (A.3).

To prove (A.4) - (A.7), we differentiate the Klein-Gordon equation with respect to t (twice to prove (A.6) and (A.7)) and argue as above,taking into account the initial conditions

$$\partial_t^2\dot{\Phi}(0) = -c^2 l(0) \tag{A.18}$$

$$\partial_t^3\dot{\Phi}(0) = c^2\big[(\Delta - \kappa^2)\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\big]. \tag{A.19}$$

□

Corollary A-3. *Assume the hypotheses of Lemma A-2, and let* $C_0(\kappa)$ *be the constant appearing in the conclusions of the lemma. Then*

$$|||\, \dot{\Phi} \,|||_{H^{N+1},T}^2 \leq \big(C_0(\kappa)\big)^2 \cdot \big(c^{-2}\|\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N}^2 + 2\cdot T\cdot \,|||\, \partial_t\dot{\Phi} \,|||_{H^N,T} \cdot \,|||\, l \,|||_{H^N,T}\,\big). \tag{A.20}$$

Proof. Inequality (A.12) gives that $\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(E^2(t)) \leq \|\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^N}\|l(t)\|_{H^N}$. Taking into account (A.15) and (A.17), the proof of (A.20) easily follows. □

Lemma A-4. *Let* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, *and* $\mathcal{J} \in H^{N-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. *Suppose that* $\dot{\Phi} \in H^{N+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and that* $\Delta\dot{\Phi} - \kappa^2\dot{\Phi} = \mathcal{J}$. *Then*

$$\|\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^{N+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C(N,\kappa)\|\mathcal{J}\|_{H^{N-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \tag{A.21}$$

Proof. For use in this argument, we define the Fourier transform through its action on integrable functions F by $\widehat{F}(\xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(\mathbf{s})e^{-2\pi i\xi\cdot\mathbf{s}}\, d\mathbf{s}$. The following chain of inequalities uses standard results from Fourier analysis, including Plancherel's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^2}^2 &\leq C\|(1+|2\pi\xi|^2)^2\widehat{\dot{\Phi}}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\kappa)\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\kappa^2+|2\pi\xi|^2)^2|\widehat{\dot{\Phi}}(\xi)|^2\, d^3\xi \\ &= C(\kappa)\|(\kappa^2-\Delta)\dot{\Phi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = C(\kappa)\|\mathcal{J}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{A.22}$$

and this proves (A.21) in the case $N = 1$. To estimate L^2 norms of the k^{th} order derivatives of $\dot{\Phi}$ for $k \geq 1$, we differentiate the equation k times to arrive at the equation $\Delta\big(\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\big) - \kappa^2\big(\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\big) = \nabla^{(k)}\mathcal{J}$, and argue as above to conclude that

$$\|\nabla^{(k)}\dot{\Phi}\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C(\kappa)\|\nabla^{(k)}\mathcal{J}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{A.23}$$

Now we add the estimate (A.22) to the estimates (A.23) for $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ to conclude (A.21). □

Remark A.1. The hypothesis $\dot{\Phi} \in H^{N+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ does not follow from the remaining assumptions. For example, consider $g(x) = e^x$. Then $g - \frac{d^2}{dx^2}g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, but $g \notin H^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proposition A-5. *Assume the hypotheses of Lemma A-1. Assume further that*
$l \in C^0([0,T], H^N(\mathbb{R}^3))$, $\partial_t l \in C^0([0,T], H^{N-1}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, *and* $\partial_t^2 l \in C^0([0,T], H^{N-2}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}|||\, \dot{\Phi} \,|||_{H^{N+1},T} &\leq C(N,\kappa) \\ &\quad\cdot \big(c^{-1}\|\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N} + \|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + |||\, l \,|||_{H^{N-1},T} + T\,|||\, \partial_t l \,|||_{H^{N-1},T}\,\big)\end{aligned} \tag{A.24}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|||\, \partial_t\dot{\Phi} \,|||_{H^N,T} &\leq C(N,\kappa) \\ &\quad\cdot \big(c\|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + \|(\Delta-\kappa^2)\mathring{\dot{\Psi}}_0 - \partial_t l(0)\|_{H^{N-2}} + |||\, \partial_t l \,|||_{H^{N-2},T} + T\,|||\, \partial_t^2 l \,|||_{H^{N-2},T}\,\big).\end{aligned} \tag{A.25}$$

Proof. Define $\mathcal{J} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} l + c^{-2}\partial_t^2\dot{\Phi}$ and observe that $\dot{\Phi}$ is a solution to

$$\Delta\dot{\Phi} - \kappa^2\dot{\Phi} = \mathcal{J}. \tag{A.26}$$

By inequality (A.5) of Lemma A-2, Lemma A-4, and the triangle inequality, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{(A.27)} \qquad ||| \dot{\Phi} |||_{H^{N+1},T} &\leq C(N,\kappa)\, ||| l + c^{-2}\partial_t^2 \dot{\Phi} |||_{H^{N-1},T} \\
&\leq C(N,\kappa)\big(c^{-1}\|\overset{\circ}{\dot{\Psi}}_0\|_{H^N} + \|l(0)\|_{H^{N-1}} + ||| l |||_{H^{N-1},T} + T\, ||| \partial_t l |||_{H^{N-1},T}\big),
\end{aligned}
$$

which proves (A.24).

Because $\partial_t\dot{\Phi}$ satisfies the equation $-c^{-2}\partial_t^3\dot{\Phi} + \Delta\big(\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\big) - \kappa^2\big(\partial_t\dot{\Phi}\big) = \partial_t l$, we may use a similar argument to prove (A.25); we leave the simple modification, which makes use of (A.7), up to the reader. $\square$

B. Sobolev-Moser Estimates

In this Appendix, we use notation that is as consistent as possible with our use of notation in the body of the paper. To conserve space, we refer the reader to the literature instead of providing proofs: propositions B-2 and B-4 are similar to propositions proved in chapter 6 of [9], while Proposition B-5 is proved in [11]. The corollaries and remarks below are straightforward extensions of the propositions. With the exception of Proposition B-6, which is a standard Sobolev interpolation inequality, the proofs of the propositions given in the literature are commonly based on the following version of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [13], together with repeated use of Hölder's inequality and/or Sobolev embedding:

Lemma B-1. *If $i,k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq i \leq k$, and $\mathbf{V}$ is a scalar-valued or array-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mathbf{V} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\|\nabla^{(k)}\mathbf{V}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty$, then*

$$
\text{(B.28)} \qquad \|\nabla^{(i)}\mathbf{V}\|_{L^{2k/i}} \leq C(k)\|\mathbf{V}\|_{L^\infty}^{1-\frac{i}{k}}\|\nabla^{(k)}\mathbf{V}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{i}{k}}.
$$

Proposition B-2. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact set, and let $j,d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j > \frac{d}{2}$. Let $\mathbf{V} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be an element of $H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and assume that $\mathbf{V}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset K$. Let $F \in C_b^j(K)$ be a $q \times q$ matrix-valued function, and let $G \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a $q \times q$ ($q \times 1$) matrix-valued (array-valued) function. Then the $q \times q$ ($q \times 1$) matrix-valued (array-valued) function $(F \circ \mathbf{V})G$ is an element of $H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$
\text{(B.29)} \qquad \|(F\circ\mathbf{V})G\|_{H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C(j,d)|F|_{j,K}(1 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)}^j)\|G\|_{H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
$$

Corollary B-3. *Assume the hypotheses of Proposition B-2 with the following changes: $\mathbf{V}, G \in C^0([0,T], H^j(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then the $q \times q$ ($q \times 1$) matrix-valued (array-valued) function $(F \circ \mathbf{V})G$ is an element of $C^0([0,T], H^j(\mathbb{R}^d))$.*

Remark B.1. We often make use of a slight modification of Proposition B-2 in which the assumption $\mathbf{V} \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is replaced with the assumption $\mathbf{V} \in H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\bar{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a constant array. Under this modified assumption, the conclusion of Proposition B-2 is modified as follows:

$$
\text{(B.30)} \qquad \|(F\circ\mathbf{V})G\|_{H^j} \leq C(j,d)|F|_{j,K}(1 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}}^j)\|G\|_{H^j}.
$$

A similar modification can be made to Corollary B-3.

Proposition B-4. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact, convex set, and let $j,d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j > \frac{d}{2}$. Let $F \in C_b^j(K)$ be a scalar or array-valued function. Let $\mathbf{V}, \widetilde{\mathbf{V}} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$, and assume that $\mathbf{V}, \widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume further that $\mathbf{V}(\mathbb{R}^d), \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset K$. Then $F\circ\mathbf{V} - F\circ\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$
\text{(B.31)} \qquad \|F\circ\mathbf{V} - F\circ\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j} \leq C(j,d,\|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j},\|\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j})|F|_{j+1,K}\|\mathbf{V} - \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j}.
$$

Remark B.2. As in Remark B.1, we may replace the hypotheses $\mathbf{V}, \widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ from Proposition B-4 with the hypotheses $\mathbf{V}, \widetilde{\mathbf{V}} \in H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, in which case the conclusion of the proposition is:

$$
\text{(B.32)} \qquad \|(F\circ\mathbf{V}) - (F\circ\widetilde{\mathbf{V}})\|_{H^j} \leq C(j,d,\|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}},\|\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}})|F|_{j+1,K}\|\mathbf{V} - \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j}.
$$

Furthermore, a careful analysis of the special case $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} = \bar{\mathbf{V}}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{V}} \in K$ is a constant array, gives the bound

$$
\text{(B.33)} \qquad \|F\circ\mathbf{V} - F\circ\bar{\mathbf{V}}\|_{H^j} \leq C(j,d)|\partial F/\partial\mathbf{V}|_{j-1,K}(1 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}}^{j-1})(\|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}}),
$$

in which we require less regularity of F than we do in the general case.

Proposition B-5. *Assume the hypotheses of Proposition B-2 with the following two changes:*

(1) *Assume* $j > \frac{d}{2} + 1$.

(2) *Assume that* $G \in H^{j-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *with* $1 \leq k \leq j$, *and let* $\vec{\alpha}$ *be a spatial derivative multi-index with* $|\vec{\alpha}| = k$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\left((F \circ \mathbf{V})G\right) - (F \circ \mathbf{V})\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}G\|_{L^2} \\
&\qquad \leq C(j,d)|\partial F/\partial \mathbf{V}|_{j-1,K}(\|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j} + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j}^j)\|G\|_{H^{j-1}}. \qquad \text{(B.34)}
\end{aligned}$$

Remark B.3. As in Remark B.1, we may replace the assumption $\mathbf{V} \in H^j(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in Proposition B-5 with the assumption $\mathbf{V} \in H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$ is a constant array, in which case we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}\left((F \circ \mathbf{V})G\right) - (F \circ \mathbf{V})\partial_{\vec{\alpha}}G\|_{L^2} \\
&\qquad \leq C(j,d)|\partial F/\partial \mathbf{V}|_{j-1,K}(\|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}} + \|\mathbf{V}\|_{H^j_{\bar{\mathbf{V}}}}^j)\|G\|_{H^{j-1}}. \qquad \text{(B.35)}
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition B-6. *Let* $N', N \in \mathbb{R}$ *be such that* $0 \leq N' \leq N$, *and assume that* $F \in H^N(\mathbb{R}^d)$. *Then*

$$\|F\|_{H^{N'}} \leq C(N',d)\|F\|_{L^2}^{1-N'/N}\|F\|_{H^N}^{N'/N}. \qquad \text{(B.36)}$$

References

[1] N. Andersson and G. L. Comer, *Relativistic fluid dynamics: Physics for many different scales [online article] [cited 3-5-08] http://relativity.livingreviews.org/Articles/lrr-2007-1/*, Living Reviews in Relativity, 10, pp. 1–83.

[2] S. Calogero, *Spherically symmetric steady states of galactic dynamics in scalar gravity*, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 20 (2003), pp. 1729–1741.

[3] ———, *Global classical solutions to the 3D Nordström-Vlasov system*, Communications in Mathematical Physics, 266 (2006), pp. 343–353.

[4] S. Calogero and H. Lee, *The non-relativistic limit of the Nordström-Vlasov system*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences, 2 (2004), pp. 19–34.

[5] D. Christodoulou, *Self-gravitating relativistic fluids: A two-phase model*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 130 (1995), pp. 343–400.

[6] ———, *The Action Principle and Partial Differential Equations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2000.

[7] ———, *The Formation of Shocks in 3-Dimensional Fluids*, European Mathematical Society, Zürich, Switzerland, 2007.

[8] Y. Guo and S. Tahvildar-Zadeh, *Formation of singularities in relativistic fluid dynamics and in spherically symmetric plasma dynamics*, Contemporary Mathematics, 238 (1999), pp. 151–161.

[9] L. Hörmander, *Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1997.

[10] M. Kiessling, *The "Jeans swindle:" a true story—mathematically speaking*, Advances in Applied Mathematics, 31 (2003), pp. 132–149.

[11] S. Klainerman and A. Majda, *Singular limits of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limit of compressible fluids*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 34 (1981), pp. 481–524.

[12] T. Makino, *On a local existence theorem for the evolution equation of gaseous stars*, Patterns and Waves - Qualitative Analysis of Nonlinear Differential Equations, (1986), pp. 459–479.

[13] L. Nirenberg, *On elliptic partial differential equations*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Classe di Scienze), 13 (1959), pp. 115–162.

[14] G. Nordström, *Zur Theorie der Gravitation vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzips*, Annalen der Physik, 42 (1913), pp. 533–554.

[15] T. A. Oliynyk, *The Newtonian limit for perfect fluids*, Communications in Mathematical Physics, 276 (2007), pp. 131–188.

[16] A. D. Rendall, *The initial value problem for a class of general relativistic fluid bodies*, Journal of Mathematical Physics, 33 (1992), pp. 1047–1053.

[17] C. D. Sogge, *Lectures on nonlinear wave equations*, Monographs in Analysis, II, International Press, Boston, MA, 1995.

[18] J. Speck, *Well-posedness for the Euler-Nordström system with cosmological constant*, Accepted for Publication in the Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations; preprint available at arXiv:0802.2090v3, (2008), pp. 1–47.